MAY 1964

# MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 16

1

## THE COLONIAL WAR AT HOME

THE EDITORS

## INTERVIEW WITH MALCOLM X

A. B. SPELLMAN

*Paul A. Baran*

PAUL M. SWEEZY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# CONTENTS

VOLUME SIXTEEN NUMER ONE MAY 1964

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Colonial War At Home ..... 1
INTERVIEW WITH MALCOLM X by A. B. Spellman ..... 14
PAUL A. BARAN by Paul M. Sweezy ..... 25
IMPERIALIST DILEMMAS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA by William J. Pomeroy ..... 27
ISRAEL AND CHINA by Ursula Wassermann ..... 37
NEWSPAPERS? by Alex Crosby ..... 43
POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE
by Andrew Gunder Frank ..... 47
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing ..... 51
BOOKS: YESTERDAY'S SUBVERSIVES by Stephen H. Fritchman ..... 57
WHERE WE STAND by the Editors ..... 62

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright ©1964, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $9; everywhere else $11.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

## NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

While we were in the midst of completing plans to celebrate *MR's* birthday in May, we received the sad and shocking news that Paul Baran had died of a heart attack in San Francisco on the evening of March 26th at the age of 53. As long-time readers of *MR* know, he was very closely associated with us almost from the beginning and wrote frequently for the magazine. One of the things we are most proud of is that MR Press had the privilege of publishing *The Political Economy of Growth*, one of the most important Marxist works of our time which, by now translated and published in nine languages, has probably done more than any other book to shape the views of the younger generation of progressive social scientists all over the world on the crucial questions of underdevelopment and what must be done to liquidate it.

A memorial meeting for Paul Baran was held on the Stanford University campus (where he was a professor of economics) on April 2, and we include in this issue the brief remarks made on that occasion by the one *MR* editor who was able to be present. Believing that his many friends in the East will also wish to have an opportunity to pay tribute to his memory, we have made plans to hold a second memorial meeting on Sunday, May 24th. This will be held at 3 P.M. in the Heywood Broun Room of the New York Newspaper Guild's headquarters, 133 West 44th Street, New York City. Professor Robert Lynd, retired Columbia soci-

*(continued on inside back cover)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## THE COLONIAL WAR AT HOME

By the time this issue of *MR* reaches readers, it will be just a year since the Birmingham demonstrations and riots. Commenting on these events, we noted that the Negro liberation movement as then constituted had no meaningful program for dealing with the real problems of American Negroes—extreme poverty, ghettoization, unemployment—and that for this reason every apparent success it might achieve would only bring it closer to crisis. Our conclusion was:

> If we are right, what the Negroes of this country need is a new movement which, taking the best features of the liberation movement and Black Muslimism, adds fresh ideas and a genuinely *radical* approach to the existing social order. (*MR*, June, 1963, p. 77.)

The forecast turned out to be accurate even sooner than we expected. The greatest "success" of all was the August March on Washington, and its complete failure to produce concrete results precipitated the crisis which has been deepening ever since. The new movement began to emerge at about the same time, and two events of the past month have given it a strong impetus. These were Malcolm X's break with Elijah Muhammad and assumption of an openly *political* leadership role (on this see the interview with Malcolm which begins on page 14 below), and the refusal of three New York City chapters of CORE to heed their own national leaders over plans to tie up traffic bound for the opening of the World's Fair (we are of course writing before that event takes place).

"We haven't been able to achieve a thing," Louis Lomax, author of *The Negro Revolt* (reviewed in *MR*, March, 1963), told an audience of Negro professional women on April 12th. "Martin Luther King wrapped his dream in love, and while it was ricocheting between Lookout Mountain in Chattanooga,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tennessee, and the Gulf of Mexico, it turned into a nightmare." And now, Mr. Lomax continued, "wild, new, strange voices have moved into the leadership vacuum and we are headed for bloodshed and chaos."*

What are these "wild, new, strange" voices saying? So many different and often contradictory things that any attempt at analysis may seem foolhardy. And yet we think there is enough coherence in what they say, and perhaps still more in what they imply, to make possible a useful, even if tentative, characterization of the new movement which is now emerging.

One thing all the voices agree upon is the failure, definitive and irrevocable, of the old movement. And since this is the common premise from which they start, we can expect to discover what is most essential in their message by contrasting the ideas and methods they express with those of the movement they now repudiate.

The old movement took it for granted, and still does, that Negroes in this country are first and foremost Americans who have been immorally and illegally deprived of the rights guaranteed them by the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Emancipation Proclamation. Far from rejecting the country's institutions, the Negro in this view is their most loyal supporter and asks only for what he has every right to. His methods should be consistent with this conception of himself and his society, peaceful, orderly, and above all lawful, for it is precisely the sanctity of the law which he himself is insisting on.

If we are to understand what is now happening we must recognize that it is not only possible to reject these views in their entirety but also to reject some of them while continuing, consciously or unconsciously, to hold others. And perhaps as good a way as any to classify the new voices is according to the extent of their rejection of the old views.

The more moderate of the new voices continue to regard Negroes as Americans deprived of their rights and to pursue the goal of full incorporation into American society. Where they

*Report by Joseph Lelyveld, *New York Times*, April 13.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

differ from the old leaders is on the question of methods. This attitude can be seen very clearly in the case of the World's Fair "stall-in" threats. The method involved is radically different from the traditional one of demonstrations aimed at specific persons or institutions held to be guilty of violating Negro rights. No accusations have been leveled against the Fair itself; it has been chosen as the focus of a demonstration simply because its position at the center of what will in any case be an enormous traffic jam offers the organizers of the demonstration an excellent opportunity to demonstrate real power—power to paralyze movement which, if carried to its logical conclusion, would become the power to strangle organized social life. By choosing automobile traffic as the point at which to apply pressure, the New York CORE people show a keen understanding of American society and its technical weaknesses. The old-line civil rights leaders were therefore partly right when they declared (on April 17th) that the stall-in is a "revolutionary proposal."* But they should have added that the objectives of the CORE leaders are no more revolutionary than their own. These objectives, as told to the press by Isaiah Brunson, chairman of Brooklyn CORE, on April 15th are as follows:

> The closing of all city construction sites and a grand jury investigation of all unions that are alleged to have practiced discrimination.
>
> A city-authorized rent strike at all slum buildings in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx, and a grand jury investigation of slum landlords.
>
> The immediate desegregation of all high schools, a moratorium on school construction in ghetto areas, and a timetable for total school desegregation.
>
> A public review board to investigate all policemen charged with brutality. (*New York Times,* April 16.)

*In a joint declaration at a session of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington. Those who endorsed the declaration were Roy Wilkins of NAACP, James Farmer of national CORE, Whitney Young of the Urban League, and John Lewis of SNCC. They stated that they were also speaking for Philip Randolph of the Negro Labor Council and Dorothy Haight of National Council of Negro Women, and felt sure that Martin Luther King would also give his approval. These people make up what is, in effect, the general staff of the old movement.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are evidently all demands of a familiar sort, designed to widen the opportunities open to Negroes to participate in American life as equals of whites. The difference is that they are backed up not by demonstrations at construction sites, school boycotts, picketing of city hall or police stations, etc., but by a threat to paralyze a part of the city's life.

The philosophy behind the stall-in tactic has been explicitly and excellently formulated in general terms by Rev. Albert B. Cleage, Jr., the leading figure in the Freedom Now Party in Detroit which is spearheading a drive to get on the ballot in Michigan in November. Writing in the Detroit *Illustrated News* of which he is one of the editors, Rev. Cleage stated (February 17):

> In terms of the realities of the situation, we have got to evolve a strategy of chaos. Deliberately we have got to tear up everything that doesn't give us an equal shake. They say the Negroes have always had a genius for tearing up things. I'm not talking about that natural ability that we have to tear up things. I'm talking about a deliberately conceived plan to tear up those things from which we are excluded, those things that do not give us equality of opportunity, anything that exists in these United States—either accept us in it, or—we'll do everything possible to tear it up.

This is talk calculated to scandalize the old-line leadership and its white sympathizers. If Negroes act this way, they cry out in anguish, they will lose the good will of whites, which is precisely what they need more of if they are to achieve their aims. Cleage's answer to this is that of the entire new movement: "Let's get this straight," he wrote in the same article. "The white man doesn't intend to give the Negro equality. He doesn't mean to do it. If he does it, it is going to be because he was forced to do it, not because he was persuaded or converted." But the goal of equality within the present society remains unchallenged. Once again, as in the case of the New York CORE people, the means are potentially revolutionary, but the end is the familiar one, which may even be described as conservative since American capitalism without a race problem would undoubtedly be a much stronger system than is American capitalism today.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many of the new voices, however, go beyond rejecting the means advocated by the old movement, to reject its goals as well and in many cases to reject the entire conception of Negroes as Americans striving to shape a specifically American destiny. But before discussing these new and more radical doctrines, we must digress briefly to ask whether they are not already implicit in traditional black nationalism as exemplified in particular by the Black Muslims.

While there can be no doubt that Black Muslimism is in an important sense a forerunner of the new Negro radicalism, there seems to be a gap between the two which is not only quantitative but also qualitative in character. The Muslims reject the methods of the old movement, but their own ideas in this respect, which seem to be limited to making demands for the territory on which to found a black nation, certainly represent a step backward as against the mass demonstrations organized by Martin Luther King. And their goal of a separate black nation seems not only to be utopian in the bad sense of the term but also to represent, even in imagination, nothing but the re-creation of American capitalism minus white people.

In sharp contrast to Black Muslimism, the new Negro radicalism is moving toward a thorough-going revolutionary position not only on methods but on goals as well. And in the course of doing so it is rapidly shedding the traditional conception of Negroes as a minority struggling for their rights as Americans in favor of a radically new conception of American Negroes as part of an international colored majority struggling for a new world. The clearest statement we have yet seen of this new revolutionary position is by Max Stanford, a young college-educated Negro who is Field Chairman of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). Here are excerpts from his article "Towards Revolutionary Action Movement Manifesto," which appeared in the Detroit monthly *Correspondence* of March, 1964:

> RAM was officially organized in the winter of 1963 by Afro-Americans who favored Robert F. Williams and the concept of organized violence. Through a series of workshop discussions, the group decided there was a need for a "Third Force" or movement that would be somewhere between the Nation of Islam (Black



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Muslims) and SNCC (Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee). . . .

The motto was "One Purpose, One Aim, One Destiny," meaning:

ONE PURPOSE—To free black people from the universal slavemaster (slang for capitalist oppression).

ONE AIM—To develop black people through struggle to the highest attainment possible.

ONE DESTINY—To follow in the spirit of black revolutionaries such as Gabriel Prosser, Toussaint L'Ouverture, Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, Frederick Douglass, Marcus Garvey, Dr. DuBois, Robert F. Williams, and to create a new world free of colonialism, racism, imperialism, exploitation, and national oppression.

Thus RAM was officially organized as a movement. With rotating chairmen to develop leadership, RAM immediately plunged into action. [Here follows an account of what was done in the following months in Philadelphia where RAM was founded, including participation in demonstrations at a school construction site.]

To answer some questions raised by "orthodox black nationalists" and charges that RAM is an integrationist group, I will explain why we participated in the school construction site struggle.

As revolutionary black nationalists we do not believe that standing on the street corners alone will liberate our people. Revolutionary black nationalists must act as a vanguard to show our people how to seize power so that they may gain some control over their lives. The main reason they are treated the way they are is that they are powerless. In the school construction site demonstration, our people saw the system denying them opportunity. As our struggle developed, they saw that the police who represent the state or state power were not on our side but on the side of those who uphold racism. This brought in the concept of government, protection of the community by a black people's police force, and the concept that we are at war with white America. Thus by our action, our people gained a vital lesson in the need for a revolutionary organization that has power by physical example and involvement.

RAM soon found that just being out in the streets was not enough and that national revolutionary organization was the key to victory of our revolution. RAM also shifted its program to an accent on youth. After careful analysis through action and study, RAM feels that black youth are the key to our revolution. We see youth all over the world leading the revolutions of our people. In the Angolan liberation army the soldiers' age range is 17-20; in



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Congo's guerrilla force called "Youth" the age range is 14-20; in the Vietcong the age range is 14-19; in Kenya the Mau Mau was started by roving bands of youth. In Cuba Castro's forces were very young.

During the summer of 1963 RAM reorganized and sent field organizers throughout the North to help local groups organize demonstrations. Through our experience we have developed an organization on three levels of involvement: (1) *Field Organizers* who are full-time organizers with a period of orientation and training in the movement; (2) *Active Members* who cannot be full-time but actively support RAM by physical, financial, and other help, and have also been through a period of orientation; (3) *Associate Members* who have been through a period of orientation but, for reasons approved by the movement, cannot give physical support but do pledge financial support. During the fall of 1963, RAM field organizers helped groups throughout the South develop a perspective beyond the limits of the integrationist movement. . . .

RAM philosophy may be described as revolutionary nationalism, black nationalism, or just plain blackism. It is that black people of the world (darker races, black, yellow, brown, red, oppressed peoples) are all enslaved by the same forces. RAM's philosophy is one of the world black revolution or world revolution of oppressed peoples rising up against their former slavemasters. Our movement is a movement of black people who are coordinating their efforts to create a "new world" free from exploitation and of oppression of man by man.

In the world today there is a struggle for world power between two camps, the haves (Western or white capitalist nations), and the have-nots (Eastern or newly independent nations struggling for independence, socialist nations). There are two types of nationalism. One type suppresses or oppresses, that is, a nation or particular group reaps profits or advances materially at the expense, exploitation, slavery, or torture of another group or nation. In this nation and in the world today, this nationalism is considered "white nationalism" or the cooperation of the white Western nations to keep the new emerging oppressed world in bondage. This is capitalist or reactionary nationalism. The other type of nationalism is to liberate or free from exploitation. That is the binding force of a nation or particular group to free itself from a group or nation that is suppressing or oppressing it. In this country and in the world, this is considered black nationalism or revolutionary nationalism.

We can see that black nationalism is the opposite of white nationalism; black nationalism being revolutionary and white being reactionary. We see also that nationalism is really internationalism today.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This extraordinary document shows that RAM, despite its original placing of itself "somewhere between the Nation of Islam and SNCC," has already left those organizations far behind. Max Stanford displays a profound understanding of the world situation. He sees the crucial role of struggle not merely as a method of seeking immediate goals but as a form of education and a method of raising the political consciousness and the militancy of the oppressed. His organizational ideas are mature and appropriate to the existing situation in the United States today. Above all, he is perfectly clear about the main point: American Negroes can expect nothing from a system the whole purpose of which is exploitation of the many for the benefit of the few; they must therefore reach out for the substance of power wherever possible (control of police within the ghettos is suggested, at least by implication, as a realistic goal), but they must have no illusions about the possibility of final victory except in conjunction with the final victory of the world revolution. All of this testifies to a level of theoretical understanding and clarity which is truly remarkable for the United States, where protest movements in the past—Negro or radical or both—can justly be said to be famous for their theoretical poverty.

Many white radicals, especially the older ones, will be repelled by what they consider to be the racist character of this, as of any other, kind of black nationalism. And it certainly cannot be claimed that Negro radicals are immune to the uglier forms of racism. Malcolm X, for example, recently spoke under the auspices of the Militant Labor Forum to a predominantly white radical audience in a manner that would have been far more appropriate if he had been addressing his worst enemies. Nevertheless, while one must deplore and work to eliminate this sort of irrational racism wherever it appears, one must also maintain a sense of perspective. In this connection, there are two major points to keep in mind.

First, it is a *fact* that the worst forms of capitalist exploitation have from the very beginning run along racial lines and that they were forcibly imposed by whites on coloreds. It is also a fact that during the last hundred years the great majority of the white working people in the exploiting imperialist countries



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been cut in on a share of the surpluses wrung from the labor of the exploited races and therefore have a stake in preserving the system of exploitation. This is especially true of the United States which not only exploits a world-wide empire but has a super-exploited black sub-proletariat at home. Under these circumstances to wish for a world revolution which does not pit colored against white and which makes no appeals to the past history and the revolutionary solidarity of the colored peoples is exactly the same thing as wishing for no revolution at all.

Second, the racism of revolutionary black nationalism is not only not the same as the racism of the white supremacists, it is the very opposite. It is in no sense exclusive—note that Max Stanford not only equates "black people of the world" with all the "darker races" but actually includes in the same category all "oppressed peoples" (which presumably means that Latin Americans and Arabs are among the "black people of the world"). And it has nothing in common with doctrines of alleged racial superiority/inferiority, being concerned rather with overthrowing the all-too-real politico-economic domination of coloreds by whites. It is of course true that revolutionary black nationalism has a rather low opinion of white radicals, but the explanation has much less to do with their race than with their past ineffectiveness. Where, as in Cuba and Algeria, real revolutions have been led by whites, they have been unreservedly accepted by revolutionary black nationalists. And if the latter are beginning to have their doubts about the Russians, the real reason is not because the Russians are white but because they seem to lack a sense of the urgency of getting on with the "black" revolution *now* and not a decade or two hence after the Russians have shown that socialism can produce a higher standard of living than capitalism.

It may be said that we are attributing too much importance to American Negro radicalism of the RAM variety; that among the new voices to which Louis Lomax calls attention, that of Max Stanford and those who think like him are hardly more than a whisper; and that the people to watch are the Rev. Cleage and all the others whose thinking still runs in terms of the goal of Negro inclusion in the American system on a basis of equality. One can accept the major premise of this



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

argument without accepting its conclusion. It is of course true that the new Negro radicalism is a very small movement, but so is every movement in its early stages of development. The interesting question is its growth potential, and in particular its likely appeal to the Cleages whose break with the old ways of thinking and acting is still only partial.

In our opinion both the growth potential and the likely appeal are considerable, even in the relatively near future. The half-way position now occupied by those who reject the old methods but accept the old goals is inherently unstable and untenable. We have already quoted Rev. Cleage: "The white man doesn't intend to give the Negro equality. . . . If he does it, it is going to be because he was forced to do it, not because he was persuaded or converted." The question is simply whether the new "strategy of chaos" can force him to do it. We do not believe that it can. But what it can and will do is to prove to an ever growing number of Negroes that they are, in Max Stanford's words, "at war with white America." Rev. Cleage, and no doubt many others who still hope that Negro demands will be met, knows full well that such a moment of truth may be approaching. In the article cited above, he expressed the point in the form of an analogy:

> You know the old game the kids used to play on the highway—they called it "Chicken." Two people get into a car and drive towards each other and see who chickens out first. Well that is what we are playing now. And if the white community thinks we are going to chicken out first, they are in for a terrible disappointment. Because we will play chicken right up until the explosion comes.

It looks now as though both sides are going to play chicken right up to the explosion. And after that it seems only logical to predict a rapid and far-reaching radicalization of the Negro movement.

Most Americans, black as well as white, probably think that if and when it comes to open warfare, the whites' vast superiority in numbers and armaments will ensure a quick and crushing defeat for the blacks. But it is important to recognize that this is *not* the view of the new Negro radicalism. Writing from his place of exile in Havana, Robert F. Williams has given a searing



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

account of the kind of struggle he foresees—and why he thinks a black victory possible:

There are those mercenary Uncle Toms and masochists among us whose missions are to demoralize our people and encourage them to reject the first law of nature. They are quick to inform us that we cannot win any conflict that may degenerate into a state of massive violence. Why do they not tell the racist oppressors that they cannot win? Why do they not tell them that they constitute a minority in the world? The fact is that the racists are the ones who will lose such a conflict. America is too sensitive to withstand such a shock. The oppressors have more to lose than the dehumanized and oppressed in such a conflict. Our people have nothing to lose but their chains.

We prefer peaceful negotiations, but our oppressors have proved to us that they are not susceptible to such mild pressures for reform and that they will utilize massive violence to attempt to contain our struggle. When massive violence comes, the U.S.A. will become a bedlam of confusion and chaos. The factory workers will be afraid to venture out on the streets to report for their jobs. The telephone workers and radio workers will be afraid to report. All transportation will grind to a complete standstill. Property will be damaged and expensive buildings will be reduced to ashes. Essential pipe lines will be severed and blown up and all manner of sabotage will occur. Violence and terror will spread like a firestorm. A clash will occur inside the armed forces. At U.S. military bases around the world local revolutionists will side with Afro G.I.'s. Because of the vast area covered by the holocaust, U.S. forces will be spread too thin for effective action. U.S. workers, who are caught on their jobs, will try to return home to protect their families. Trucks and trains will not move the necessary supplies to the big urban centers. The economy will fall into a state of chaos.

This racist imperialist oppressor will not be brought to his knees, simply because of the fighting ability and military power of Black Freedom Fighters and their allies inside the U.S., but because of the creation of economic chaotic conditions, total disorganization, frustration of his essential ultra-vital organs of production, and adverse conditions created by the world-wide liberation struggle. Such a formidable enemy will fall prey to the new concept of revolution because of his ultra-modern and automated society and lack of psychological conditioning of his forces. Our people have already been conditioned by almost 400 years of violence, terror, and hunger.

The new concept of revolution defies military science and tactics. The new concept is lightning campaigns conducted in highly sensitive urban communities and spreading to the farm



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

areas. The old method of guerrilla warfare, as carried out from the hills and countryside, would be ineffective in a powerful country like the U.S.A. Any such force would be wiped out in an hour. The new concept is to huddle as close to the enemy as possible so as to neutralize his modern and fierce weapons. The new concept creates conditions that involve the total community, whether they want to be involved or not. It sustains a state of confusion and destruction of property. It dislocates the organs of harmony and order and reduces the central power to the level of a helpless, sprawling octopus. During the hours of the day sporadic rioting takes place and massive sniping. Night brings all-out warfare, organized fighting, and unlimited terror against the oppressor and his forces. Such a campaign will bring about an end to oppression and social injustice in the U.S.A. in less than 90 days and create the basis for the implementation of the U.S. Constitution with justice and equality for all people.

Of course there would be great losses by our people. How can we expect liberation without losses? Our people are already being admonished by the non-violent forces to die for Freedom. We are being told to sacrifice our lives in situations of diminishing returns. If we must die, let us die in the only way that the oppressor will feel the weight of our death. Let us die in the tried and proven way of liberation. If we are going to talk about revolution, let us know what revolution means. . . .

It is no longer a truism that our people cannot win such a struggle. The world has changed and the favor of the situation has shifted to the side of the Afro-American. Those who cry that we cannot win are either agents of the oppressor, latent masochists, or ignorant of the new facts of life. We do not need paternal white "big daddies" for our friends now. What we need are some fighting John Browns.

Our friends are growing throughout the world, while those of our oppressors are diminishing. It is important that we immediately create stronger ties with our brothers of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. It is important that our people stop cooperating with our oppressor and exert more efforts to expose his beastly ways to the peoples of the world. Yes, we can win because our struggle is just and our friends are many. The handwriting is already on the wall. Victory is now within our reach. LET US PREPARE TO SEIZE IT! (*The Crusader,* Monthly Newsletter, Robert F. Williams, Publisher—in exile—February, 1964.)

This apocalyptic vision of violence may be nothing but a terrible nightmare. On the other hand, the way things are going now only a fool would deny that it may be an essentially



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

truthful foreshadowing of what the future holds in store. In any case, there are dark days and angry storms ahead.

In his syndicated column of April 1, Joseph Alsop, referring to the civil rights bill now before the Senate, wrote that "this bill is the last, best chance to avoid something very like a colonial war in America." It would be much nearer the truth to say that it is already much too late to avoid something very like a colonial war in America.

(April 18, 1964)

---

### OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

We must recognize that the young in many areas of the world today are in the midst of a revolution against the status quo. Their anger is turned on systems which have allowed poverty, illiteracy and oppression to flourish for centuries.

We must recognize one central fact. They will prevail. They will achieve their idealistic goals one way or another. If they have to pull governments tumbling down over their heads, they will do it. But they are going to win a share of a better, cleaner world.

—*Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy in speech to the Canadian Press, reported in* New York Times, *April 15, 1964.*

THE MONTHLY REVIEW 15th ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE

invites you to a

Birthday Celebration Meeting

in which

**Barrows Dunham** will be Master of Ceremonies

**Leo Huberman - Scott Nearing - Paul M. Sweezy**

will speak

**E. Y. Harburg** will entertain

Refreshments Will Be Served

Date: WEDNESDAY, MAY 13th, AT 8:30 P.M.

Place: PARK-SHERATON HOTEL, 7th AVE. and 56th ST.

ADMISSION: $2.50 1963-1964 ASSOCIATES: FREE

Send your order for tickets, with payment enclosed, to

MR 15th ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE

P.O. Box 994, Ansonia Station New York, N. Y. 10023



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# INTERVIEW WITH MALCOLM X

## BY A. B. SPELLMAN

The Muslims, as the Nation of Islam is called, stress the futility of the integrationist program. They argue that there is no precedent for the absorption of Negroes into the greater white American mainstream in fact or in history, that integrationists are asking for something the American socio-economic system is inherently unable to give them—mass class mobility, so that at best Negroes can expect from the integrationist program a hopeless entry into the lowest levels of a working class already disenfranchised by automation.

The Muslims tell Negroes to be proud of their African heritage, to make a new identity for themselves by adopting an X or a Muslim surname and dropping their "slave name," thereby severing all ties with a history of subservience to whites. The Muslims have urged Negroes to be polite in their dealings with whites and to be non-violent, even if provoked. But if attacked, the Muslims say, a Negro should defend himself by any means at his disposal. The Muslim solution to the race problem in America is separation of the races, either in the allocation to Negroes of several states in the South or the repatriation of Negroes to Africa. (The separatist solution has been in the programs of several movements varying in size and appeal since the early nineteenth century, culminating in the Garvey movement which, though irreparably fragmented, still has considerable appeal in many major Negro communities.) Estimates of Muslim membership have ranged from 10,000 to 250,000.

There had been rumors for some months to the effect that a split was developing in the upper ranks of Muslim leadership between a conservative and highly religiously-oriented faction led by Mr. Muhammad's family (which controls all the money)

---

This article is appearing simultaneously in *Revolution*. A. B. Spellman is a young Negro poet and jazz critic. His first book of poems, *The Beautiful Day and Others*, is being published this year by Brownstone Press.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and a political activist faction led by Malcolm X. The split came early this March when Malcolm left the Nation of Islam to start an all-black political party. Malcolm is an overwhelming public speaker, particularly in Harlem where his positive demagogy is unchallengeable in the heart and eyes of his audience, and in question and answer, or in debating situations where the stark realities of his uncompromising ghetto-eyed point of view can usually embarrass his antagonist, especially if that opponent is a black or white liberal. Malcolm is a product of the ghetto. He is the crystalization of whatever revolutionary impulse exists in the ghetto. He is an organizer and administrator of proven ability. For these reasons, he has the potential of becoming one of the really major revolutionists in America today.

The following interview with Malcolm X, formerly the minister of the New York City and Washington, D.C. mosques of the Lost-Found Nation of Islam, headed by The Honorable Elijah Muhammad, was held on March 19, 1964.

SPELLMAN: Please answer these charges that are often raised against you: That you are as racist as Hitler and the Klan, etc. That you are anti-Semitic. That you advocate mob violence.

MALCOLM X: No, we're not racists at all. Our brotherhood is based on the fact that we are all black, brown, red, or yellow. We don't call this racism, any more than you could refer to the European Common Market which consists of Europeans which means that it consists of white-skin people—is not referred to as a racist coalition—it's referred to as the European Common Market, an economic group—while our desire for unity among black, brown, red, and yellow is for brotherhood—has nothing to do with racism, has nothing to do with Hitler, has nothing to do with the Klan—in fact, the Klan in this country was designed to perpetuate an injustice upon Negroes whereas the Muslims are designed to eliminate the injustice that has been perpetuated upon the so-called Negro.

We're anti-exploitation and in this country the Jews have been located in the so-called Negro community as merchants and businessmen for so long that they feel guilty when you



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mention that the exploiters of Negroes are Jews. This doesn't mean that we are anti-Jews or anti-Semitic—we're anti-exploitation.

No. We have never been involved in any kind of violence whatsoever. We have never initiated any violence against anyone, but we do believe that when violence is practiced against us we should be able to defend ourselves. We don't believe in turning the other cheek.

SPELLMAN: Why did you find it necessary to split with the Nation of Islam?

MALCOLM X: Well, I did encounter opposition within the Nation of Islam. Many obstacles were placed in my path, not by the Honorable Elijah Muhammad, but by others who were around him and since I believe that his analysis of the race problem is the best one and his solution is the only one, I felt that I could best circumvent these obstacles and expedite his program better by remaining out of the Nation of Islam and establishing a Muslim group that is an action group designed to eliminate the same ills that the teachings of the Honorable Elijah Muhammad have made so manifest in this country.

SPELLMAN: What is the name of the organization that you have founded?

MALCOLM X: The Muslim Mosque Inc., which means we are still Muslims—we still worship in a mosque and we're incorporated as a religious body.

SPELLMAN: Can other Muslims work with the Muslim Mosque Inc. without leaving the Nation of Islam?

MALCOLM X: Oh yes. Yes anyone who is in the Nation of Islam who wants to work with us and remain in the Nation of Islam, is welcome. I am a follower of the Honorable Elijah Muhammad—I believe in the Honorable Elijah Muhammad. The only reason I am in the Muslim Mosque Inc. is because I feel I can better expedite his program by being free of the restraint and the other obstacles that I encountered in the Nation.

SPELLMAN: Will you have access to *Muhammad Speaks?*

MALCOLM X: Probably not. No, I very much doubt that the same forces which forced me out would permit me access to the *Muhammad Speaks* newspaper as an organ although I am



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the founder of the paper, the originator of the paper. Few people realize it—I was the one who originated *Muhammad Speaks* newspaper. The initial editions were written entirely by me in my basement.

SPELLMAN: Will you start another publication?

MALCOLM X: Yes. One of the best ways to propagate any idea is with a publication of some sort and if Allah blesses us with success we will have another publication. We'll probably name it the *Flaming Crescent* because we want to set the world on fire.

SPELLMAN: How religious is the Muslim Mosque Inc.? Will it be more politically oriented?

MALCOLM X: The Muslim Mosque Inc. will have as its religious base the religion of Islam which will be designed to propagate the moral reformation necessary to up the level of the so-called Negro community by eliminating the vices and the other evils that destroy the moral fibre of the community—this is the religious base. But the political philosophy of the Muslim Mosque will be black nationalism, the economic philosophy will be black nationalism, and the social philosophy will be black nationalism. And by political philosophy I mean we still believe in the Honorable Elijah Muhammad's solution as complete separation. The 22,000,000 so-called Negroes should be separated completely from America and should be permitted to go back home to our African homeland which is a long-range program; so the short-range program is that we must eat while we're still here, we must have a place to sleep, we must have clothes to wear, we must have better jobs, we must have better education; so that although our long-range political philosophy is to migrate back to our African homeland, our short-range program must involve that which is necessary to enable us to live a better life while we are still here. We must be in complete control of the politics of the so-called Negro community; we must gain complete control over the politicians in the so-called Negro community, so that no outsider will have any voice in the so-called Negro community. We'll do it ourselves.

SPELLMAN: Whom do you hope to draw from in organizing this political movement—what kind of people?



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MALCOLM X: All—we're flexible—a variety. But our accent will be upon youth. We've already issued a call for the students in the colleges and universities across the country to launch their own independent studies of the race problem in the country and then bring their analyses and their suggestions for a new approach back to us so that we can devise an action program geared to their thinking. The accent is on youth because the youth have less stake in this corrupt system and therefore can look at it more objectively, whereas the adults usually have a stake in this corrupt system and they lose their ability to look at it objectively because of their stake in it.

SPELLMAN: Do you expect to draw from the Garveyite groups?

MALCOLM X: All groups—Nationalist, Christians, Muslims, Agnostics, Atheists, anything. Everybody who is interested in solving the problem is given an invitation to become actively involved with either suggestions or ideas or something.

SPELLMAN: Will the organization be national?

MALCOLM X: National? I have gotten already an amazing number of letters from student groups from college campuses from across the country expressing a desire to become involved in a united front in this new idea that we have.

SPELLMAN: What kind of coalition do you plan to make? Can whites join the Muslim Mosque Inc.?

MALCOM X: Whites can't join us. Everything that whites join that Negroes have they end up out-joining the Negroes. The whites control all Negro organizations that they can join—they end up in control of those organizations. If whites want to help us financially we will accept their financial help, but we will never let them join us.

SPELLMAN: Then black leadership is necessary?

MALCOLM X: Absolutely black leadership.

SPELLMAN: Will you work with the so-called "established" civil rights organizations?

MALCOLM X: Well, we will work with them in any area and on any objective that doesn't conflict with our own political, economic, and social philosophy which is black nationalism. I might add that I was invited to attend a civil rights group



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meeting where all of the various civil rights organizations were present and I was invited to address them in Chester, Pennsylvania. Gloria Richardson was there; Landrey, the head of the Chicago School Boycott, was there; Dick Gregory was there; many others were there; the Rochedale movement was there. Now my address to them was designed to show them that if they would expand their civil rights movement to a human rights movement it would internationalize it. Now, as a civil rights movement, it remains within the confines of American domestic policy and no African independent nations can open up their mouths on American domestic affairs, whereas if they expanded the civil rights movement to a human rights movement then they would be eligible to take the case of the Negro to the United Nations the same as the case of the Angolians is in the UN and the case of the South Africans is in the UN. Once the civil rights movement is expanded to a human rights movement our African brothers and our Asian brothers and our Latin American brothers can place it on the agenda at the General Assembly that is coming up this year and Uncle Sam has no more say-so in it then. And we have friends outside the UN—700,000,000 Chinese who are ready to die for human rights.

SPELLMAN: Do you intend to collaborate with such other groups as labor unions or socialist groups or any other groups?

MALCOLM X: We will work with anybody who is sincerely interested in eliminating injustices that Negroes suffer at the hands of Uncle Sam.

SPELLMAN: What is your evaluation of the civil rights movement at this point?

MALCOLM X: It has run its—it's at the end of its leash.

SPELLMAN: What groups do you consider most promising?

MALCOLM X: I know of no group that is promising unless it's radical. If it's not radical it is in no way involved effectively in the present struggle.

SPELLMAN: Some local civil rights leaders have said they'd welcome your support, some national leaders have said they want nothing to do with you, what is your reaction?

MALCOLM X: Well, the local civil rights leaders are usual-



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly involved right in the midst of the situation. They see it as it is and they realize that it takes a combination of groups to attack the problem most effectively and, also, most local civil rights leaders have more independence of action and usually they are more in tune and in touch with the people. But the national leaders of the civil rights movement are out of touch with the problem and usually they are paid leaders. The local leaders usually have a job and they lean against the local situation on the side, but the nationally known leaders are paid. They are full-time leaders, they are professional leaders and whoever pays their salary has a great say-so in what they do and what they don't do, so naturally the ones who pay the salaries of these nationally known Negro leaders are the white liberals and white liberals are shocked and frightened whenever you mention anything about some X's.

SPELLMAN: What is your attitude toward Christian-Gandhian groups?

MALCOLM X: Christian? Gandhian? I don't go for anything that's non-violent and turn-the-other-cheekish. I don't see how any revolution—I've never heard of a non-violent revolution or a revolution that was brought about by turning the other cheek, and so I believe that it is a crime for anyone to teach a person who is being brutalized to continue to accept that brutality without doing something to defend himself. If this is what the Christian-Gandhian philosophy teaches then it is criminal—a criminal philosophy.

SPELLMAN: Does the Muslim Mosque Inc. oppose integration and intermarriage?

MALCOLM X: We don't have to oppose integration because the white integrationists themselves oppose it. Proof of which, it doesn't exist anywhere where white people say they are for it. There's just no such thing as integration anywhere, but we do oppose intermarriage. We are as much against intermarriage as we are against all of the other injustices that our people have encountered.

SPELLMAN: What is the program for achieving your goals of separation?

MALCOLM X: A better word to use than separation is in-



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dependence. This word separation is misused. The 13 colonies separated from England but they called it the Declaration of Independence; they don't call it the Declaration of Separation, they call it the Declaration of Independence. When you're independent of someone you can separate from them. If you can't separate from them it means you're not independent of them. So, your question was what?

SPELLMAN: What is your program for achieving your goals of independence?

MALCOLM X: When the black man in this country awakens, becomes intellectually mature and able to think for himself, you will then see that the only way he will become independent and recognized as a human being on the basis of equality with all other human beings, he has to have what they have and he has to be doing for himself what others are doing for themselves, so the first step is to awaken him to this and that is where the religion of Islam makes him morally more able to rise above the evils and the vices of an immoral society and the political, economic, and social philosophy of black nationalism instills within him the racial dignity and the incentive and the confidence that he needs to stand on his own feet and take a stand for himself.

SPELLMAN: Do you plan to employ any kind of mass action?

MALCOLM X: Oh, yes.

SPELLMAN: What kinds?

MALCOLM X: We'd rather not say at this time, but we definitely plan to employ mass action.

SPELLMAN: How about the vote—will the Muslim Mosque Inc. run its own candidates or support other candidates?

MALCOLM X: Since the political structure is what has been used to exploit the so-called Negroes, we intend to gather together all of the brilliant minds of students, not the adult politicians who are part of the corruption but the students of political science, we intend to gather all of them together and get their findings, get their analyses, get their suggestions, and out of these suggestions we will devise an approach that will



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enable us to attack the politicians and the political structure where it hurts the most, in order to get a change.

SPELLMAN: If the Muslim Mosque Inc. joined in a demonstration sponsored by a non-violent organization, and whites countered with violence, how would your organization react?

MALCOLM X: We are non-violent only with non-violent people—I'm non-violent as long as somebody else is non-violent —as soon as they get violent they nullify my non-violence.

SPELLMAN: A lot of leaders of other organizations have said they would welcome your help but they qualify that by saying "if you follow our philosophy." Would you work with them under these circumstances?

MALCOLM X: We can work with all groups in anything but at no time will we give up our right to defend ourselves. We'll never become involved in any kind of action that deprives us of our right to defend ourselves if we are attacked.

SPELLMAN: How would the Muslim Mosque Inc. handle a Birmingham, Danville, or Cambridge—what do you think should have been done?

MALCOLM X: In Birmingham, since the government has proven itself either unable or unwilling to step in and find those who are guilty and bring them to justice, it becomes necessary for the so-called Negro who was the victim to do this himself, and he would be upholding his constitutional rights by so doing, and Article 2 of the constitution—it says concerning the right to bear arms in the Bill of Rights: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Negroes don't realize this, that they are within their constitutional rights to own a rifle, to own a shotgun, and when the bigoted white supremists realize that they are dealing with Negroes who are ready to give their lives in defense of life and property, then these bigoted whites will change their whole strategy and their whole attitude.

SPELLMAN: You've said this will be the most violent year in the history of race relations in America. Elaborate.

MALCOLM X: Yes. Because the Negro has already given up on non-violence. This new-thinking Negro is beginning to realize



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that when he demonstrates for what the government says are his rights then the law should be on his side. Anyone standing in front of him reclaiming his rights is breaking the law. Now, you're not going to have a law-breaking element inflicting violence upon Negroes who are trying to implement the law, so that when they begin to see this, like this, they are going to strike back. In 1964 you'll find Negroes will strike back, there never will be non-violence anymore, that has run out.

SPELLMAN: What is your evaluation of Monroe?

MALCOLM X: I'm not too up on the situation in Monroe, N. C. I do know that Robert Williams became an exile from this country simply because he was trying to get our people to defend themselves against the Klu Klux Klan and other white supremist elements, and also May Mallory was given 20 years or something like that because she was also trying to fight the place of our people down there; so this gives you an idea of what happens in a democracy—in a so-called democracy—when people try to implement that democracy.

SPELLMAN: You often use the word revolution, is there a revolution underway in America now?

MALCOLM X: There hasn't been. Revolution is like a forest fire. It burns everything in its path. The people who are involved in a revolution don't become a part of the system—they destroy the system, they change the system. The genuine word for a revolution is *Umwälzung* which means a complete overturning and a complete change and the Negro Revolution is no revolution because it condemns the system and then asks the system that it has condemned to accept them into their system. That's not a revolution—a revolution changes the system, it destroys the system and replaces it with a better one. It's like a forest fire like I said—it burns everything in its path and the only way to stop a forest fire from burning down your house is to ignite a fire that you control and use it against the fire that is burning out of control. What the white man in America has done, he realizes that there is a Black Revolution all over the world—a non-white revolution all over the world—and he sees it sweeping down upon America and in order to hold it back he ignited an artificial fire which he has



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

named the Negro Revolt and he is using the Negro Revolt against the real Black Revolution that is going on all over this earth.

SPELLMAN: Can the race problem in America be solved under the existing political-economic system?

MALCOLM X: No.

SPELLMAN: Well then, what is the answer?

MALCOLM X: It answers itself.

SPELLMAN: Can there be any revolutionary change in America while the hostility between black and white working classes exists? Can Negroes do it alone?

MALCOLM X: Yes. They'll never do it with working class whites. The history of America is that working class whites have been just as much against not only working class Negroes, but *all* Negroes, period, because all Negroes are working class within the caste system. The richest Negro is treated like a working class Negro. There never has been any good relationship between the working class Negro and the working class whites. I just don't go along with—there can be no worker solidarity until there's first some black solidarity. There can be no white/black solidarity until there's first some black solidarity. We have got to get our problems solved first and then if there's anything left to work on the white man's problems, good, but I think one of the mistakes Negroes make is this worker solidarity thing. There's no such thing—it didn't even work in Russia. Right now it was supposedly solved in Russia but as soon as they got their problems solved they fell out with China.

SPELLMAN: Will the Muslim Mosque Inc. identify with non-white revolutionary movements in Africa, Asia, and Latin America?

MALCOLM X: We are all brothers of oppression and today brothers of oppression are identified with each other all over the world.

SPELLMAN: Is there anything else you want to say?

MALCOLM X: No. I've said enough—maybe I've said too much.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# PAUL A. BARAN

## BY PAUL M. SWEEZY

I could easily speak about Paul Baran for an hour or two, or even more. I feel privileged to have this opportunity to speak about him for a minute or two.

We were collaborating on a book at the time of his death, and had been for a number of years. We used to curse the obstacles which delayed our completing the work—other commitments, separation by a continent, his illness. And yet I must confess that I would not have liked it to go too fast. Collaborating with Paul was, in terms of intellectual stimulation and genuine human friendship, the best thing that could happen to a man. I would not have wanted it one day shorter; I would have loved to have had it many years longer, on a whole succession of books.

There is an aspect of Paul Baran's many-sided life which is, I suspect, too little known to those amongst whom he lived. Taking the world as a whole, and I mean not only that small part of the world in North America and Western Europe which is too often thought of as the only part that counts in these matters, I have little hesitation in saying that no American economist, indeed no social scientist, was more looked up to and admired. His magnum opus, *The Political Economy of Growth,* has been translated into nine languages and has circulated widely on all continents. I speak from vivid personal experience when I say that he is the *maestro,* the revered teacher, of the younger generation of Latin American economists, compared to whom no other American economist is capable of arousing nearly the same degree of intellectual response and personal loyalty. And I can well believe that the same condition prevails in most other

---

This is the text of remarks made at a memorial meeting held in Cubberley Hall on the Stanford University campus, April 2, 1964.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parts of that "third world" about which he wrote with so much insight and passion.

I do not want to give the impression that it was only in the third world that Paul was held in high esteem. It may be true that he was "a prophet without honor in his own country," but certainly not in Europe and Japan. The enthusiasm and warmth of the many invitations to visit and teach at institutions of higher learning on his sabbatical, which was to have been next year, are witness to that. Even I was surprised by the red-carpet treatment being prepared for him on the continent of his birth, both East and West.

Finally, I must say something to you of the credo by which Paul lived, and I cannot do so better than in his own words. After defining the duty of the true intellectual as that of relentlessly criticizing the status quo in the interests of the advancement of the human condition, Paul Baran concluded his essay on "The Commitment of the Intellectual" with the following words:

> It may be said that I am identifying being an intellectual with being a hero, that it is unreasonable to demand from people that they should withstand all the pressures from vested interests and brave all the dangers to their individual well being for the sake of human advancement. I agree that it would be unreasonable to *demand* it. Nor do I. From history we know of many individuals who have been able even in its darkest ages and under the most trying conditions to transcend their private, selfish interests and to subordinate them to the interests of society as a whole. It always took much courage, much integrity, and much ability. All that can be hoped for now is that our country too will produce its "quota" of men and women who will defend the honor of the *intellectual* against all the fury of dominant interests and against all the assaults of agnosticism, obscurantism, and inhumanity.

Let it be said that he was of that quota. A great man and a great intellectual has left us.

---

The function of reason is to promote the art of life.
—*Alfred North Whitehead*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# IMPERIALIST DILEMMAS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

BY WILLIAM J. POMEROY

Since the Second World War nearly a score of wars of liberation, revolts, interventions, and counter-revolutionary attempts have occurred in Southeast Asia, the irregular, chopped-up area that extends from Burma across Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Malaya and out over the great scattering of islands that comprise Indonesia and the Philippines.

In two major instances the people of the region were successful in throwing out their colonial overlords: the Indonesians expelled the Dutch imperialists in the 1945-1949 War of Independence and the Vietnamese ousted the French from Indo-China in the bitter guerrilla war of 1947-1954. In two other important cases the imperialists, through large-scale and costly intervention, managed to suppress national liberation struggles: in Malaya the British put down the liberation forces in the long "Emergency" of 1948-1956, and in the Philippines American-directed "mailed fist" campaigns from 1946 to 1956 suppressed the mass-supported *Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan.*

Today all the remaining imperialist powers with interests in the area—the United States, Britain, and France—are at odds, each trying to work out a grand strategy best suited to its own ends.

The stakes contested for by the imperialist powers are large. Southeast Asia is a developing market area with a population of over 200 million people. Its wealth includes a major part of the world's tin, rubber, oil, copra, sugar, and spices, all produced with cheap labor and commanding high prices on the world market. Military suppression in Malaya enabled the British monopolists to preserve direct investments that total half a billion dollars; single British tin corporations

---

An American in England, William Pomeroy is the author of *The Forest,* a book dealing with his experiences as an active participant in the Philippine Huk movement.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have reported annual dividends of 400 percent. American military measures against Filipino liberation forces protected private investments that go beyond $400 million; in the ten-year period from 1950-1960 when economic controls imposed by the Huk emergency severely limited the remittance of profits by foreign investors, American interests still sent home around $250 million.

Reasons of military strategy have also contributed to the tenacity of the imperialist hold. The American naval and air base complex in the Philippines, left intact under the neo-colonial independence granted in 1946, throws a shadow whose arc covers China as well as the Malayan peninsula and Indonesia. The British Unified Far East Command, with headquarters in Singapore, is not only protecting Malayan tin mines and rubber plantations, it also provides insurance for the huge Commonwealth investments in India and Australia.

When the French colonialists were driven out of what is now Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia in 1954, American imperialists advanced with alarm the theory of "the falling dominoes" (that the loss of one colony in the region might bring on the loss of all the others, like one domino falling against another). Therefore they hastily concluded the 1954 Manila Pact, which set up the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), the declared intention of which was "to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their [the member countries'] integrity and political stability."

SEATO was a flimsy screen for American intervention throughout Southeast Asia. Although Britain, France, Australia, and New Zealand were brought into it for window-dressing, and a point was stretched to include Pakistan, it was almost wholly an American affair, with the Philippines and Thailand being the only Southeast Asian countries roped in to be "protected." The late John Foster Dulles got around this shortcoming by unilaterally proclaiming a SEATO "umbrella" over South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Under the illegal "protective shade" of this umbrella, Americans have intervened in South Vietnam and in Laos and have attempted to do so in Cambodia.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEATO, more than any other measure, drove Indonesia to take a strong anti-colonial attitude during the past decade, particularly when the Organization, operating from American bases in the Philippines, supported the abortive Indonesian "colonel's revolt" in 1958.

The French had a demonstration of what was meant by the American conception of countering "subversive activities directed from without" when American interests, under the umbrella of American armed forces, moved into South Vietnam and, in ruthless bone-picking fashion, took over French economic interests there.

The lesson of South Vietnam has not been lost on the British: they have kept Malaya out of SEATO and out from under the American "umbrella."

For some time the United States, its interventions turning out badly and faced with an untenable situation in South Vietnam, has been seeking to replace SEATO by a new grouping of independent, essentially anti-Communist states with a semi-neutral complexion behind which the imperialist prop would not be so obvious. An initial step in this direction was the Association of Asian States (ASA) which the Philippines, with American encouragement, promoted in conjunction with Malaya and Thailand in 1961-1962. An attempt to involve Indonesia failed.

ASA was short-lived. Before it had gotten fully under way it was disrupted by British moves to protect her interests in Southeast Asia. These were threatened by strong anti-colonial forces within the various segments of Britain's sphere, forces which were close to winning political power through parliamentary means in Singapore, Sarawak, and Brunei. (The latter two protectorates with Sabah, or British North Borneo, are located in the northern part of the otherwise-Indonesian island of Borneo.) Britain's response to these pressures, added to that created by the predictable collapse of the American position in South Vietnam, was the creation of a new Federation of Malaysia, with the Sultan-Premier of Malaya, Tunku Abdul Rahman, at its head. This federation included Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, and Sabah. (The tiny oil-rich sultanate of Brunei, nestled securely between Sarawak and Sabah, remained



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outside.) A military treaty provided for the use of Malayan and British troops to put down popular movements in any part of the federation.

The creation of Malaysia brought into the open a great tangle of antagonisms. The first eruption was a revolt in Brunei led by a liberation-minded anti-Malaysia Partai Rakyat (People's Party). Significantly, its leader, S. M. Azahari, was in Manila at the time of the revolt and from there proclaimed the independent state of Kalimantan Utara (North Borneo) embracing the three British colonies of the island of Borneo. Azahari evidently had links with American interests for, when the revolt started, he publicly declared that he would give Americans a share of Brunei's oil in exchange for recognition. British troops drove the rebels into the jungle, but they could not prevent guerrilla warfare from spreading through Sarawak and Sabah.

As the concept of Malaysia was taking shape, the United States saw an opportunity in the midst of the dangerous tensions that it provoked. Indonesia, which viewed Malaysia as a scheme to put the army of a colonial power both on its front doorstep in Singapore and at its back door in Borneo, was prepared to be drawn into a new regional grouping together with the American-dominated Philippines. President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Diosdado Macapagal of the Philipines persuaded Malayan Premier Abdul Rahman, to meet with them in Manila early in August, 1963, and prevailed upon him to agree to a wholly new regional association called Maphilindo (MAlaya, PHILippines, INDOnesia). It was a case of an American-designed circle being drawn large enough to enclose the smaller British-drawn circle.

The *New York Times* of August 9, 1963, hailed Maphilindo as "a promising venture" and "a logical response to the need for a Southeast Asian counterbalance to the looming might of Communist China." At the same time it deplored "the divergence of motivations" on the part of the member countries. "Divergencies" mentioned by the *Times* editorial were: a Philippine tendency to loosen ties with the United States and to move toward closer relations with Indonesia, an Indonesian



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire to become a new power center in Asia, and Malaya's narrow attachment to Malaysia.

It was significant that the *Times* called Maphilindo "a promising venture" despite two Articles that were included in the agreements reached at the Maphilindo conference: (1) "That the three nations shall combine their efforts in the common struggle against colonialism and imperialism in all their forms and manifestations and for the eradication of vestiges thereof in the region in particular and in the world in general"; (2) that "foreign bases temporary in nature should not be allowed to be used directly or indirectly to subvert the national independence of any of the three countries. In accordance with the principle enunciated at the 'Bandung Conference,' the three countries will abstain from the use of arrangements of collective defense to serve the particular interests of any of the Big Powers."

Britain's reaction to the Maphilindo move was to rush through the formation of Malaysia, formally launching the Federation on September 16, 1963. Indonesia and the Philipines promptly retaliated by breaking off relations with Malaya. The Indonesians even vowed to "crush Malaysia" and gave open support to the guerrilla war against the British in North Borneo.

American policy-makers viewed these events with dismay and accused the British of blundering. Not only had the regional grouping that was in the making been split, but another armed struggle for liberation that could only benefit the more militant anti-colonial forces throughout Southeast Asia was under way.

Two other factors arose now that increased the alarm of the United States: its South Vietnam position deteriorated further, and France recognized the People's Republic of China. France's move was coupled with de Gaulle's proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia. This, the third imperialist concept to be tossed into the ferment of the region, was France's attempt to beat the Americans to the punch and to restore French interests at the expense of those who had knifed them before. The concept of neutrality (already being advocated by Cambodia and in both North and South Vietnam), linked with the strengthening of China's position, could well bring



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about realignments unfavorable to the American position before its grand new strategy could be completed.

Fear of this was obviously behind the hasty mission of Robert Kennedy to Sukarno, Macapagal, and Abdul Rahman late in January, 1964, a mission which succeeded in bringing about a cease-fire in North Borneo favorable to Indonesia and a revival of steps to implement Maphilindo. Kennedy, visiting Prime Minister Home in London after his *fait accompli* (reportedly he went on his mission without prior consultation with the British government), was bitterly criticized in the British press for sabotaging Malaysia and for making a deal with Sukarno at Britain's expense.

A key element in these cross-cutting maneuvers is obviously the role of Indonesia. For years the United States has tried in every possible way to swing Indonesia into its orbit. It has encouraged counter-revolution (in the "colonel's revolt" of 1958); it has sought to win over the Indonesian army leadership; it has alternately extended and withdrawn economic aid; it has sought to bolster the national bourgeoisie around Sukarno against the powerful Communist Party.

Over the past decade one significant fact has become clear to American strategists: For the foreseeable future Sukarno's leadership is secure and, for all his anti-colonial stance, he has held his balance against the Communist-led forces. As a matter of fact, when the United States Seventh Fleet extended its range of operations into the Indian Ocean, it reportedly met with the approval of Indonesian army leaders who looked upon it, not as a threat to Indonesia but as a barrier against Communist China.

Thus, circumstances in Southeast Asia today have led increasing numbers of imperialist thinkers to accept the idea inherent in Maphilindo, of "Asians taking care of Asian affairs"—providing the Asians in question are non-Communist Indonesians like Sukarno or General Abdul Harris Nasution (chief of the Indonesian army), or "moderate" Filipino nationalists, or nationalists of the stripe of Lee Kuan Yew in Singapore (who was elected by anti-colonial forces and then repudiated them). Maphilindo has been referred to by both the Indonesian and Filipino leaders as a means of countering "Communist expan-



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion." A concept of a Greater Maphilindo with this outlook, stretching from the Philippines and Indonesia to Burma, has been cropping up in the pro-American press in the Philippines since last October.

Early in January, 1963, the United States-trained chief of staff of the Indonesian army, Lieut. Gen. Ahmad Jani, addressed the Indonesian Army Staff Command School on the nation's "wider perspective." He said: "Our political concept is to eliminate the direct confrontation of the two blocs [East and West] in Southeast Asia and to turn over the responsibility of security and stability in the region to Southeast Asian countries themselves." Indonesian troops, he asserted, could fill that security role.

General Nasution, over-all Indonesian army chief, said in another January interview: "Even the Americans are all for Maphilindo. They are beginning to understand our situation here. I had a conference with President Johnson . . . and I am glad that he understands the Asian situation. He said that he would like to see Asia have Asian solutions to its problems."

The Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI) has criticized Sukarno's involvement in Maphilindo, which it calls a "distraction" that draws attention and effort away from the anti-colonial struggle at home. SOBSI, the left-wing trade union federation in Indonesia, has reflected this attitude by demanding a "confrontation against imperialism" on all fronts; it has mounted a drive to confiscate foreign-owned firms, particularly British, as an anti-Malaysia move. Sukarno has tried to halt this effort of the workers with official edicts.

While no Southeast Asian grouping has significance without the inclusion of Indonesia, it is, however, the Philippines that is the main U.S. base and instrument in the region. Long regarded by other Asians as an American stooge, Philippine administrations since that of Ramon Magsaysay have tended, with tacit American approval, to forge links with the Afro-Asian bloc. Today the administration of President Diosdado Macapagal has proclaimed a "shift to Asia" policy, but, as Macapagal points out, this policy does not "necessarily conflict with the ideals of the Free World. As a matter of fact, we give substance



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to these ideals in the degree that we seek their fulfillment within the immediate context of our geography."

The more independent tone of Philippine policies is not by any means a creation of American imperialism, any more than is the rest of the situation in Southeast Asia. It is rather a matter of imperialism seeking to put to its uses developing forces of industrialization and nationalism. Up to the present, American interests have tried in every possible way to prevent the emergence of Philippine industrialization; they have tried to starve it of capital and credit; they have tried to tempt it into joint-venture arrangements that would tie it to American control; they have tried to block nationalization and national preference laws in the Philippine Congress. They have bred, as a result, strong nationalist feelings.

When Indonesia and the Philippines severed relations with Malaysia in September, the step was followed within a week by a Philippine-Indonesian trade agreement which shifted the $200,000,000 entrepôt trade which Indonesia had with Singapore, to the Philippines. The main Filipino negotiator of the agreement was the president of the six-year old, nationalistic Philippine Chamber of Industries. He asserted that the Philippines would now become "the trading center of Southeast Asia" and that the agreement "brings forth visions of a $200,000,000 entrepôt trade through a free trade zone in Davao City [on Mindanao, the Philippine island near Borneo], where Indonesia's copra, tin, rubber, and crude oil may be processed, graded, and stored for the world market, and where Indonesia's import requirements may be handled through Philippine brokers and jobbers." "We now have," he added pointedly, "a unique opportunity to break the British-Chinese [overseas Chinese] stranglehold on the rubber and tin trade."

These are the visions of the ambitious young Filipino capitalists who conceive of a fully independent industrialized Philippines dominating Southeast Asia, including perspectives of steel mills, aluminum plants, oil refineries, and lumber mills, with the Philippines as the processor and finisher of Indonesian raw materials.

The encouraging note in all this for American strategists is that the evolving Philippine nationalist bourgeoisie, whatever



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its frictions with American imperialism, is anti-Communist, and it endorses the concept of a regional grouping like Maphilindo in which it can prosper while holding off the influence of China or of home-grown Communist-led movements. The Philippine left-wing movement has not yet recovered sufficiently from its defeat in an armed struggle to be able to exert the type of mass anti-imperialist pressure that the PKI does in Indonesia.

Despite the present anti-Communist stance of Philippine and Indonesian leaders, the question of how far the United States can carry a neo-colonial scheme of such an ambitious and ill-sorted nature as Maphilindo is problematical. As a concept it has still to be worked out fully, and time is running out in South Vietnam. Actually, there are no more "bulwarks" left in the colonial and neo-colonial world, and this one is honeycombed with the elements of national liberation and of imperialist rivalries.

A formidable obstacle is the PKI in Indonesia, the main reason for American uncertainty about any arrangement involving that country. The PKI has 2,500,000 members, and it has in addition 6,500,000 candidates who are being put through a stiff period of preparation for membership. It is the only well-organized political force in the country, and its network of economic enterprises, cooperatives, banks (which are sounder than the government banks), and large mass organizations make it, in some respects, almost a government within a government. For the most part it has avoided frontal struggles with Sukarno's administration and has concentrated on the building of its organization while endorsing NASAKOM (national unity regime). But the recent workers' take-over of British corporations was done in spite of Sukarno's orders against it and Sukarno had to back down and put such firms as Anglo-Dutch Unilever under control of the Ministry of People's Industry. The use of the Indonesian army to police Southeast Asia also becomes less promising as the PKI penetrates the army's ranks; officers with imperialist ties may find that when the crucial orders are finally given, a decisive share of their troops will be following party rather than military discipline.

A way to bolster Sukarno and the Indonesian bourgeoisie



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the PKI is through large-scale economic assistance that could alleviate the economic chaos now prevailing due to mismanagement. This, in the long run, may be cheaper for American imperialism than a down-the-drain operation like that in South Vietnam.

There is the further problem for the United States of how to create a Greater Maphilindo with an appearance of Asian independence and still be able to fit imperialist military pacts into it. New regional groupings would lose their effect if the SEATO-type system of foreign military bases were continued. The question of how to give security to the area could possibly be solved through the extended role of the United States Seventh Fleet which is now patrolling in the Indian Ocean on a self-sufficient basis. This kind of sea-based striking force could operate from the existing naval bases in the Philippines. (It is significant that Sukarno's government has made no attack on American military treaties with the Philippines as it has done in the case of British military treaties with Malaysia.) Whatever arrangements it makes, the United States will not have a free hand in Southeast Asia. Britain will not yield easily her rooted position in Malaysia. France has her own grand strategy for the region and has given it an anti-American slant. Japan has been carefully and quietly rebuilding her trade and investment channels everywhere in Asia, and here in particular. India, which has backed the concept of Malaysia, is looking for outlets in Southeast Asia for her developing export trade and tends to follow the paths of British influence. Australia has dragged its feet on giving military aid to Malaysia because her eyes are on the trade possibilities of the huge Indonesian market. The contradictions are multiple and, what is more, all of these countries have shown that, unlike the United States, they can trade with socialist countries.

Of all the grand designs of imperialism, none has been so filled with contradictions, pitfalls, and obstacles as this one. That assessment will undoubtedly be its obituary as well as its prospectus.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# ISRAEL AND CHINA

BY URSULA WASSERMANN

The Cold War is still very cold in the Middle East and constantly threatens to flare up into renewed hostilities. Even though the Arab summit meeting at Cairo refrained from taking any decision to wage all-out war against Israel, there have been various calls for renewed guerrilla action—even Tunisia's usually mild-mannered Bourguiba asked for the formation of units of infiltrators who would "work inside Palestine for a solution to the problem." Other measures, short of war, will probably include the diversion of the Hasbani and Banias rivers, which feed the Jordan, in retaliation for Israel's diversion of the waters of the Sea of Galilee.

The pros and cons of the Water Carrier project have been debated ad nauseam and Israel has prima facie a strong case, not because she can rightfully claim that the water is needed to cultivate the Negev, but because she has adhered to the Johnston Plan, originally accepted by both parties in 1953, but later rejected by the Arabs for political, not technical, reasons. As for making the desert bloom, this is exactly what the Arab states wish to prevent, with their opposition based on military, political, and economic grounds. The Negev, forming almost two thirds of Israel's surface area, if made to bloom—or, in less Biblical language, if fully developed and settled—would, in the eyes of the Arab world, immeasurably strengthen Israel both economically and militarily, thus making a future "solution" of the Palestine problem even more of a pious dream.

What is astonishing, however, is this: Israel appears legally completely within her rights, and both the United States and the Soviet Union have publicly warned the Arabs at their summit meeting not to go to war against her; yet world public sympathy seems to lean heavily toward the Arab side, and

Ursula Wassermann is the author of several books, and a reporter with a special interest in the politics of Latin America, Europe, and Israel.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Israel finds herself today in a most precarious position of diplomatic isolation. That oil politics play their part goes without saying and is by now old hat, but that no public demonstration of solidarity should have come to Israel, even from such an ally as France, must give Jerusalem food for thought, especially after the Arab states had received the full blessings of a Chou En-lai with whom de Gaulle is carrying on more than a mild flirtation.

China's entry into the Middle East has come at a time when the Western powers, as well as the Soviet Union, are trying to neutralize the region; and China's unequivocal support of the Arab cause has introduced a new element which must necessarily weaken Israel's position. That China's present pro-Arab —and thus *ipso facto* anti-Israel—stand is not merely the outcome of her current rivalry with the Soviet Union, and her determination to strengthen her position in the non-aligned world, has become clear with the publication of David Hacohen's book *Burma Diary.*

A leading member of the majority party, Mapai, David Hacohen served as Israel's first ambassador to Burma from late 1953 to the end of 1955. From the very beginning of his tour of office, the then Chinese Ambassador in Rangoon, Yau Chou Ming, cultivated Hacohen's friendship and showed great interest in Israel and her people of whom, "he admitted, he knew very little." In effect, the Chinese diplomat told Hacohen that he was the first Jew he had ever met. However, as early as January 18, 1954, Yau Chou Ming informed his Israeli colleague of an official message from the Chinese government to the government of Israel. The message ran as follows: "The government of China has ordered me to inform you that it welcomes the fact that the State of Israel has opened an Embassy in Burma and regards this as a suitable opportunity to inform you that it wishes to form trade ties with the State of Israel. The intention is to seek imports from Israel, and we would ask you to inform us what goods, and at what quantities and prices, you would be prepared to sell us." He added that China was particularly interested in the purchase of chemical fertilizers, an industry already well developed in Israel at the time. Hacohen fully realized the difficulties involved in such future transactions,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

due both to the United States trade embargo and to the fact that Israeli industries were still young and might find it hard to meet the demands of so huge a market as China's. Nevertheless, he wrote at the time: "We should strive for links with China and for direct talks with them to be held in their country. This aim can be attained, if only our people back home overcome certain obstacles and outdated notions."

During Chou En-lai's visit to Burma in June, 1954, the Chinese Prime Minister himself extended an invitation to the Israeli diplomat to visit China as the head of a mission. Soon after, the invitation was made official and the date set for February, 1955.

In welcoming the Israeli delegation to Peking, China's Deputy Minister of Commerce pointed out that both nations "had an ancient tradition, that Israel achieved independence in 1948 and China gained full independence in 1949." They were well aware, he added, that "the Israel government had been one of the first to recognize the People's Republic of China. . . . The Chinese people respected the Jews for standing firm through all their trials and for striving for independence in spite of many obstacles. The Minister added that China hoped to develop cultural as well as economic ties between the two countries."

Three weeks later, the heads of the two delegations drew up a memorandum, the preamble of which read:

a. Both sides wish for trade ties on the basis of equality and for their mutual benefit;

b. Both sides presented the foreign trade problems of their countries, learned the lists of commodities available for trade, and examined other questions affecting trade;

c. Both sides agreed that the talks and exchange of information had laid the foundation for the development of closer commercial ties between the two countries;

d. Both sides agreed to present reports to their governments on the atmosphere prevailing during the Peking talks and to continue, through existing channels *and others yet to be formed,* to develop further the commercial ties between the two countries;

e. In the name of the Israeli government, the Israeli delegation expressed the hope that the government of People's China would send a trade delegation to visit Israel as the official guests of the Israeli government. [Emphasis added.]



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Immediately upon his return to Rangoon, Mr. Hacohen received a telephone call from the American Ambassador asking him to meet John Foster Dulles—then passing through Burma on his way back from a SEATO conference at Bangkok. The American diplomat added: "You certainly have a lot of interesting things to tell." "I certainly have," continues Mr. Hacohen's diary, "but I am under no obligation to tell them to Dulles, and am not at all keen on meeting him." However, he did not succeed in "evading," as he himself puts it, the Americans altogether, and finally told one of Dulles' assistants of his impressions of China which were highly favorable. "Nowhere had we observed signs of a hunger crisis . . . clothing, though very simple and almost uniform, was suited to the cold climate of winter in the northern province. We were surprised at the scale of workers' housing estates in the industrial cities and the social institutions being constructed everywhere on similar lines to those in advanced countries. . . . I stressed the growth of national pride and creative force. . . . I did not hide the harm, I felt, was involved in ignoring this historic development or the dangers to the United States emanating from the contempt it was displaying for those achievements of China."

At the same time, the ambassador wrote to Jerusalem: "We must remember to see to it that this mission does not remain an isolated episode to be forgotten in the course of time, and that the entire value of the mission shall not be lost because of negligence on our part—*perhaps under external influence.* The government must act without delay in all those spheres in which we have made a start." (Emphasis added.) Hacohen continued: "In my opinion we shall not make any progress in political, commercial, or cultural ties with China, if we fail to take the decisive step of exchanging ambassadors."

Without underestimating the pressure which would be brought to bear upon Israel by the United States, Hacohen persisted in his efforts to establish closer relations with China. Even "if we are on the verge of a new clash between the United States and China, we have nothing to fear from the step of forming diplomatic relations." He remained, however, a voice crying in the wilderness. On April 1, 1955, he again wired Jerusalem. "In view of the Bandung Conference, it is already



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

late enough," he said, and "for some time now, they [the Chinese] have been expecting a further step on our part. . . . A few months ago, Chou En-lai said in his major foreign policy address to the People's Congress [China's Parliament], that steps should be taken toward the exchange of diplomatic representatives with Afghanistan and Israel. . . . Even when, some time later, we attempted to justify our vote at the UN Assembly against the inclusion of the China issue on the agenda, the reply received from Peking about six weeks later through the ambassador at Rangoon stated that the government of China assumed that the government of Israel, 'which wishes to form and maintain mutual relations with China, will in future take up a correct stand concerning the status of China in the United Nations.' " This statement, adds Hacohen, "left no room for assuming that China would reject a proposal to form diplomatic ties with Israel, but clearly implied the contrary." Yet, he continues, "all my letters and cables [to Jerusalem] have been of no avail."

Bandung came and went, with "the most aggressive Arab states," in Mr. Hacohen's words, "those friendly to the United States and the West." China cast her vote together with the rest on a resolution hostile to Israel, but, added the Israeli diplomat, "the Chinese leadership may well be ignorant of all the issues involved." China, not being a member of the United Nations, would not feel herself bound by UN resolutions in regard to the Palestine problem. Moreover, "Chou En-lai did not mention Israel" in his Bandung speech, "and did not intend to touch on Israel. . . . He expressed sympathy for the [Arab] refugees in their plight, but did not, I believe, condemn Israel by even a single word. But there certainly will be no grounds whatever for hope of a change or a fair attitude on their part towards Israel . . . if Israel displays contempt for them by not wishing to form diplomatic relations. . . . The right moment was allowed to slip by—and who knows when it will return?"

These words by an Israeli diplomat who, at the end of 1955, was withdrawn from Burma, allegedly at the request of the American State Department, were written nearly nine years ago, and "the right moment" has never since returned. The Arab states, whose first contact with China dates back to



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bandung, made better use of their opportunity, although American pressure in the Arab capitals was no less strongly exerted than it was in Jerusalem. Nasser recognized Peking several months before the Suez crisis, and today China maintains missions in Cairo (accredited also to Yemen), Bagdad, Damascus, and Khartoum. Peking also maintains a large delegation in Egypt attached to the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization. David Hacohen's words in his diary of May 23, 1955, that "in the wake of meetings with the Arabs at Bandung, a certain rapprochement between the Arab states and China might develop," have been borne out by subsequent events; his hope that "this would be in no way to the detriment of Israel" and that "any pressure to this end from the Arabs would be rejected by China," has unfortunately proved to be wishful thinking, as he himself must have been the first to realize, given the course followed by Israel in terms of foreign policy, a policy dominated by Washington's continued insistence on treating Peking as beyond the pale.

To what extent the recent Franco-Chinese rapprochement will affect Israel remains to be seen. However, the winds of change are blowing in Paris with regard not only to the Far East but also to the Near East, and for the past year de Gaulle has been eager to mend such fences as had been damaged in the wake of the Suez campaign. France is anxious to make the *présence française* once more felt in the Arab countries and French foreign policy today is based almost exclusively on the creation of a third bloc which will hold the balance between Washington and Moscow and carry its full weight in decisions of world-wide importance. This third bloc, in French eyes, includes not only China and the former French territories in Africa, but even South America, which the General will visit during the course of this year. It would not be surprising if de Gaulle's next grand tour would take him to the Arab world—from the Maghreb to Egypt and Syria—since the Arab countries are most insistent in their desire to be non-aligned. When this day comes, Israel may find that she has become expendable even to her French ally. Her position will then be truly precarious and her survival may well depend on Washington's and Moscow's mutual desire to preserve the status quo.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# NEWSPAPERS?

BY ALEX CROSBY

Since I used to be an old newspaperman myself, I still look at the papers to reaffirm my conviction that the press has been going down hill steadily since my involuntary severance in 1934. Not, of course, that the newspapers were perched on a summit of editorial excellence even then. Old Man Scripps and Joseph Pulitzer left no spiritual heirs and the subsequent birth statistics have never been encouraging.

The trouble with the newspapers is that they have no heart and no energy. Once we have counted the York (Pennsylvania) *Gazette* with James Higgins and David Wesley, what is left? Well, of course, the *New York Times*. And that illustrious name reminds me of a pamphlet I wrote in 1947 for the Newspaper Guild of New York. The first paragraph read:

> Contrary to a lot of nonsense that has been written about the free and sacred press, a newspaper publisher is simply a manufacturer who aims to make as much money as he can by selling his product to the public. There's nothing wicked and nothing noble about the business. It's like making razor blades or Wheaties.

The Newspaper Guild courteously distributed advance copies of this pamphlet, *Our Frugal Bosses,* to the publishers. One copy reached and outraged Turner Catledge, an upper echelon man at the *Times*. He went around to a number of low echelon men and demanded that they read the offensive paragraph. "Is this your idea of the *New York Times*?" he asked. The reporters and deskmen professed to be as horrified as Mr. Catledge professed to be, and perhaps some of them were.

If my estimate of the newspaper business was essentially correct then (as indeed it was), it is absolutely sound today. Newspaper publishers do not identify themselves with their readers, and their papers do not dig into the controversial issues

---

Ex-newspaperman Alex Crosby is a frequent contributor to MONTHLY REVIEW.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that determine the happiness or misery of the general population—except when they are campaigning against the general welfare. The struggle for a better world is left to such individuals as Rachel Carson, Linus Pauling, Estes Kefauver, James Aronson, Scott Nearing, Dagmar Wilson, Leonard Boudin, James Dombrowski, Harry Bridges, Herman Liveright, and the editors of MONTHLY REVIEW. If these rugged and incorruptible citizens succeed in garnering a few column inches of news space—say, as much as a second-class wedding would warrant—they are more fortunate than usual. None would dare hope for a hundredth of the space bestowed on the press-fed quack, Joe McCarthy.

Honest men and honest causes are seldom grist for the mills of the publishers. When great wrongs need righting, the press finds it more comfortable to look the other way or, perhaps, to run another series on the evils of gambling or the corruption of organized labor. Too often the perpetrators of the wrongs are members of the publisher's club.

These reflections were prompted by the March 24 issue of the *Times,* which carried one of the most important news stories likely to appear this year. Written by John W. Finney from Washington, the story revealed a Public Health Service finding that the mysterious deaths of fish in the Mississippi River since 1960 had been caused by minute quantities of endrin, dieldrin, and two other poisons used to kill insects and weeds on farms.

"For the first time it has been acknowledged that the normal amounts of pesticides that find their way from fields into rivers can be injurious to fish life," Mr. Finney wrote. "This in turn is raising the question of whether the synthetic chemicals can present a health hazard in drinking water."

The fish were killed by "only a few parts a million" of poison in their flesh. The Mississippi water tested up to only 200 parts a trillion, or one part poison in 5 billion. Gradually the poison had accumulated in the fish to many times that strength.

The *Times* story did not point out that synthetic poisons are used by farmers all over the United States, not just in the Mississippi basin. Any reservoir supplied by streams that drain



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agricultural areas will have its quota of poison. Although people differ from fish in many respects, both kinds of fauna die from modest amounts of poison. It may be that water glasses should henceforth be labeled with the skull and bones.

If this story wasn't national news of top rank, it is hard to imagine any news of non-violence that would surpass it. But Mr. Finney's dispatch did not appear on the right-hand side of page one. That spot was given to a Supreme Court decision that United States courts could not question the legality of a foreign government's expropriation of property within its borders. Instead of page one, the Finney story got a quiet position on page 12 with an innocent if not misleading one-column head: "U. S. Scrutinizing Mississippi Fish." The bank in much smaller type read, "Shrimps Also Studied After Pesticide Residue Report," but many readers would already have passed up what seemed to be some kind of scientific report on fish a thousand miles from their breakfast table.

The Finney story was followed by three brief paragraphs of reassurance from the New York City Health Commissioner, Dr. Georges James. He said no Mississippi fish were sold in New York City and "virtually all" of the city's shrimp came from Mexican waters. Dr. James was either not asked about local drinking water or else had nothing to say.

Why the story was kept off page one and why the paper failed to pursue and develop the crucial drinking water aspect are questions that any critic of the daily press could answer without much delay. But the *Times* should get honorable mention for giving the story 18 inches, which is probably more than any other newspaper did.

A few days earlier the cornerstone of the old Times Tower, bought by Allied Chemical Corporation of all corporations, had been pried loose and the copper box inside officially opened by President Arthur Ochs Sulzberger of the *Times* and President Chester M. Brown of Allied Chemical. Among the keepsakes of 1904 they found a silver medal bearing the name of Hortense Bibo. Who was Hortense? The *Times* report on the dig said there was no clue to her identity.

As I remarked before, the trouble with newspapers is that they have no energy. Their staple diet is press releases and



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

official leaks. What nobody tells them, they don't know and can't find out. And so Hortense remained Miss American Mystery of 1904 until the *Times* got a telephone call from Miss Bibo, a retired office executive in the child care field. She explained in what might be called an oral press release or unofficial leak that she had won the medal in an essay contest sponsored by the *Times* during her schoolgirl years and she still had a duplicate. Further, she had been born in New York and had lived in the city all her life.

"The mystery of Hortense Bibo is solved," the *Times* followup story began. I had a hunch. I reached for the Manhattan telephone book. There it was, on page 166:

Bibo Hortense 175W93 Riverside 9-3960.

## HISTORY MOVES FAST DEPARTMENT

**U.S. Gaining in Boycott of Cuba**

Washington (AP)—Reports on Cuba's economy are being assessed in the Johnson administration as showing some success for the U.S. boycott policy, with prospects of much greater returns as time goes on. . . .

—*Oakland Tribune,* March 29, 1964

**History Proves One Thing—Embargos Just Don't Work**

Washington (AP)—The United States embargo on trade with Cuba has not paid off yet and history indicates it won't. . . .

—*Oakland Tribune,* April 14, 1964


## CHANGE OF ADDRESS

In another month the vacation period begins and many of you will be changing your address for one or two or three months. If you are one of the lucky ones who will be vacationing away from home, please save us time and money by letting us have the following information as soon as possible:

MONTHLY REVIEW 333 Sixth Ave. New York, N. Y. 10014

Please send the issues checked below to my summer address.

..... June ..... July/August ..... September

Name .....

Summer Address .....

Permanent Address .....




LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE

BY ANDREW GUNDER FRANK

Because the author, who was then in Brazil, failed to receive a copy of last October's *MR* until several months later, the following commentary on that month's Review of the Month did not reach us until March and couldn't be fitted into the April issue. The arguments presented, however, are as relevant today as they would have been last fall. Further, for our part, we find them more persuasive than we would have six months ago. The necessity of a well-prepared and militant revolutionary movement in the underdeveloped countries has been dramatically illustrated once again in Brazil. The full story has not yet been told, but it is at least conceivable that if the Communist Party there had not been following a line of collaboration with the supposedly strong national bourgeoisie represented by Goulart and instead had been mobilizing support for a revolutionary counter-attack when the inevitable right-wing military coup materialized, the outcome in Brazil might have been different. In any case, Brazil should deal the final death blow to hopes of peaceful transition in Latin America. To achieve clarity on this is now a matter of crucial importance, and there can be no doubt that the Sino-Soviet debate has done a tremendous amount to hasten the process along.—The Editors

Under the title, "What do the Chinese Want?" (October, 1963), the editors very lucidly present two of the most important arguments that have yet arisen out of the Moscow-Peking debate. Their first proposition is that it is Soviet nuclear protection of China which prevents the United States from launching a war against China at this time. Combining the consequent likelihood of an American "preventive" nuclear attack on China in case of rupture of the Chinese-Soviet alliance with the considerations that in the long run history will prove the Chinese position in the debate to be correct though no great changes are to be expected in the short run, the editors proceed to argue that China should abandon its ideological offensive and wait patiently for history to do its work in order, thus, to prevent disaster. Precisely because of their importance, both of these theses demand further discussion. I propose to question the first and challenge the second.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In their elaboration of their thesis of Soviet protection of China against American attack, the editors depart considerably from their analysis of recent months to attribute the determination of much of the world's future to the United States and to assign, at the same time, a quite passive role in history to China and to the peoples of the underdeveloped world. They say, "the answer [to the question of the consequences of a Chinese-Soviet break] depends in large part on the probable reaction on the United States." (p. 289) This interpretation appears again, still more strongly phrased in the January, 1964 number (p. 483) where the editors speak of the "historic crisis which we can now see shaping up in Vietnam," and go on to state that "the outcome, as in the case of earlier postwar crises in the Far East, will depend essentially on United States policy." What about the role of the people of Vietnam, China, and others in the Far East in determining the course of history there, we may ask. True, the editors do note that the Americans will attack only if the calculated gains exceed the probable loss to them and that an attack on China can inflict a political loss on the United States. But they apparently do not attribute any great political power to China or curiously, considering events there, to the Vietnamese people either. It is this judgment which, I suggest, requires more considerate examination than it has so far received.

A few relevant considerations may be raised as a starter. The argument about American aggressiveness in the cases of Hiroshima, Korea, and Dienbienphu is undoubtedly of great importance; but it is not necessarily conclusive. What could the Americans gain by such a nuclear attack against China in our time? In China itself, at most the possible retardation of her people's development of their economic and military potential. An attack on China now could not further the age-old American Asia policy there and reopen the door to imperialist capital. Such an attack would, however, evoke a more active anti-imperialist policy by China at home and abroad. What consequences would an American attack—even simulated as salami slicing—on China have in the rest of Asia? It is hard to believe that it would not raise the peoples of Japan, Indonesia, Southeast Asia, yes and even of India, to revolt against the source



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and cause of this "most monstrous and bloody crime in history." If history is with the Chinese, as the editors think, what more effective way has the United States to speed it up?

The matter of gains and losses for Americans raises the further question: For which Americans? The preventive warriors, out of touch with all reality and therefore unable to weigh consequences on the one hand and concerned largely with economic interests on the other hand, are no doubt ready to sacrifice Asia to gain "victory." But are the more "responsible" defenders of bourgeois interests ready to lose Asia now, either to defend "principle," or to prevent its loss later on? Whatever the answer, we may legitimately question the editors' presentation of the matter as an open-and-shut case.

The editors' second argument, even if the first one should turn out to be well taken, is more questionable still. They argue that the Chinese are right in maintaining that imperialism will break up from within, thanks to the revolt of the exploited peoples who form its basis. They adduce the experience of China, Cuba, and Vietnam as evidence that history will confirm the Chinese position. On the other hand they say that revolution is not immediately in the offing in Asia, Africa, and Latin America (a judgment with which I must unfortunately concur—*vide* my comments on Latin America in the December issue—even though the Chinese may not) and that the CPSU and other fraternal parties are not about to abandon their revisionist line tomorrow. This latter opinion may be correct insofar as it refers to the parties of Europe, Eastern and Western. But the contrary is the case in many of the countries out of which, according to the editors, the break-up of imperialism will come, as recent events in Japan, Indonesia, Oceania, and to some degree in Latin America suggest. These latter changes in domestic and international policy by Communists and others in the progressive movement are most certainly furthered by China's position (though not its "subversion," as the Soviets claim) and by its debate with the Soviet party.

As to what that policy must be in order eventually to lead to liberation, the editors rightly say that it is that of Cuba and Vietnam but that it is untimely and dangerous for China to propose the same elsewhere now. Unless, as is counseled by



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China, a similar policy is adopted by popular movements elsewhere, how, we must ask, will history prove the Chinese right? History does not act by itself while we patiently wait. History today is the complex of the forces which have their origin in the contradictions of imperialism. And these include, importantly, the mobilization of popular forces represented by existing socialist states and of those necessary to create the same elsewhere. Experience in Germany after World War I and in France and Italy after World War II amply demonstrate how history moves failing this mobilization. Without Lenin's dispute with the revisionists of the century's first two decades, and Mao's in the fourth and fifth, and Fidel's in the sixth and seventh, where would the world be now? The popular movements they represented did not find their goal achieved for them by history over night; they fought many years, as in Vietnam today. How can history prove the editors and the Chinese right in the future without the prior necessary and proper mobilization of popular forces? Their statement (p. 303) to the contrary notwithstanding, the editors have not given all the benefits of the doubt to the positive—and apparently necessary—aspects of the dispute about revisionism.

---

Do we call this the land of the free? What is it to be free from King George and continue the slaves of King Prejudice? What is it to be born free and not to live free? What is the value of any political freedom, but as a means to normal freedom? Is it a freedom to be slaves, or a freedom to be free, of which we boast?

—*Henry David Thoreau*

FRIENDS OF INDEPENDENCE FOR PUERTO RICO

This election year is crucial for Puerto Rican Independence. Puerto Rico's Pro-Independence Movement (MPI) is extending and intensifying its electoral boycott campaign because elections are absurd and humiliating under colonial conditions. For this, money is needed. Any amount will be appreciated.

Send it to Movimiento Pro-Independencia de Puerto Rico, P.O. Box 274, New York, N.Y. 10024.

(advertisement)



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WORLD EVENTS

*By Scott Nearing*

### *Washington's Special Interests in Asia*

United States special interests in Europe are easily understood. Most United States citizens were either born in Europe or else they are the children or grandchildren of Europeans. The manners, customs, and traditions of most Americans were brought over from Europe. Communication, trade, and travel keep North America and Europe in close contact. Historically, the United States was a European colony. Today it is West Europe's chief partner-competitor in the search for profit and power.

Few such ties hold North America and Asia together. Geographically, culturally, and historically the two continents are widely separated. One thing they share in common—the Pacific Ocean.

In the days when water provided the easiest and cheapest means of transportation, human beings clustered around rivers, harbors, lakes, seas, oceans. Civilizations grew up around the Mediterranean, the Red and Black Seas, the Indian Ocean. Western civilization, for the past four centuries, used first the Mediterranean and later the Atlantic Ocean as its central waterway. Through thousands of years maritime peoples traded and fought across the Mediterranean. For the past four centuries they have traded and fought across the Atlantic.

Until recent times the Pacific was too big to be humanly useful. Sailing ships crossed it—in months. It carried some commerce and a few adventurers, but it took the steam engine, the gas engine, and the airplane to make the Pacific as manageable as the Mediterranean was for row boats, or the Atlantic for sailing ships. Steam, gas, and atomic power have made the Pacific the logical center of world trade and travel and the logical battleground of the world struggle for profit, privilege, and power.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern Europe, the Near East, and North Africa touched the Mediterranean.

Western Europe, West Africa, the Caribbean, and North America girdled the Atlantic.

The Americas, Australasia, the East Indies, and Far Asia front on the Pacific and its extension, the Indian Ocean.

In Far Asia, remote from the Mediterranean, and far removed from the Atlantic, live half the members of the human family.

Such an approach, in terms of history and technology, provides one explanation for Washington's interest in Asia. Like North America, Asia borders on the Pacific. Nearly two thirds of mankind are gathered about the Pacific theater of action. With the dwarfing of Europe in the suicidal wars of 1914 to 1945, the emergence of the United States and the Soviet Union as major world powers, and the rapid modernization of Japan, China, India, and Indonesia, the Pacific is by way of becoming the center of civilization's three-ring performance.

For better or for worse, the United States occupies a ring-side place at the contest for the Pacific. There are many North Americans who feel that Washington should file claims on all of the land that borders the largest body of navigable water in the Northern Hemisphere, thus making it and keeping it their American sea.

### *Science, Technology, and the Power Struggle*

Present-day interest in the Pacific is not the outcome of chance. Discovery and invention have played a big part in turning the spotlight of world attention to Asia, the largest and most populous of the continents. Science and technology have shifted the site of the power-politics struggle from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic and more recently from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Geography and history have determined which peoples will be directly concerned in the contest for the control of Asia.

Until fifty and even thirty years ago it was taken for granted that the players in the big game of power politics would represent half a dozen European powers—Britain, France,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany, Russia, certainly; perhaps Italy, Holland, Spain. After 1898 the United States (and after 1905 Japan) entered the power struggle in the novice class, with scant possibility of winning silver or even bronze medals. Prior to 1914 the nations equipped to fight and win major wars—the Great Powers—were all European. Even as lately as 1939, Europe was looked upon as the world power center. When the Cairo Conference was held in 1943, Europeans were still confident that they would continue to wear the victor's crown, although in that year Marshal Jan Smuts of South Africa told a London audience that the great European powers had already been pushed from the center of the world stage by two novices—the United States and the Soviet Union.

It was at the Cairo Conference in 1943 that the Western Big Four Powers chose a fifth—China, represented by Chiang Kai-shek, as the Big Number Five of the postwar world. Of these five, France was no more than a shadow of its former self and Chiang was a White Man's Hope, who might make the resources of Asia available to his twin sponsors, Churchill and Roosevelt, and share the booty on terms that the two Western powers would dictate.

Cairo assumptions seem nebulous enough in 1964, although they were accepted and acted upon in good faith only two decades ago. During these twenty-one fleeting years most of colonial Asia and Africa has won independence from European imperial masters; the American-British-Soviet power trinity of 1943 has become the American-Russian-Chinese power trinity of 1964, and the basic question confronting Washington is whether United States forces can continue, indefinitely, to occupy fortified, strategic positions on the Asian side of the Pacific Ocean.

### *Is Southeast Asia Merely a Strategic Outpost?*

The American Century mirage which hypnotized so many prominent North Americans in the years following 1945 grew out of three assumptions:

(1) World events, at least in the next half century, would be determined by developments in and around the Pacific.

(2) The overwhelming defeat of Japan in 1945; the extinc-



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of Japanese economic and political interests in Manchuria, Korea, and Formosa; United States military occupation of the island chain from the Aleutians, through Japan, the Philippines, and Formosa to Singapore, made accessible by United States fortified positions across the Pacific, made that ocean an American lake from which the main forces of world life would radiate.

(3) Control of this American sea (accepted by a United States puppet government in Peking, and a United States-dominated Pacific Treaty Organization modeled along NATO lines and backed up by American land, sea, and air forces) would enable Washington to subordinate China, utilize Japan, encircle, contain, and eventually defeat the Soviet Union, wipe out communism first in Asia, then in Europe. Having won the Cold War, Washington would be in a position to inaugurate a period of world leadership, peace, and progress even broader and longer than the 19th-century era of Pax Britannica.

Thoughts like these must have been in the background of Secretary McNamara's mind when he told members of the National Security Industrial Association that the Vietnamese War must be fought to a victorious conclusion, first because Vietnam is "a member of the free world family striving to preserve its independence from Communist attack"; second, because "Southeast Asia has great strategic significance to the forward defense of the United States. Its location across east-west air and sea lanes flanks the Indian subcontinent on one side and Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines on the other, and dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans."

Since 1945 the United States has been in effective military control of the Pacific. Its present defense plans call for the extension of this control to include the Indian Ocean. Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia are integral parts of this line of Northern Hemisphere military encirclement which already includes the Mediterranean, the Atlantic, and the Caribbean.

Secretary McNamara emphasized his point by reminding his auditors that South Vietnam is:



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a narrow strip of rich coastal, mountain, and delta lands running 900 miles . . . along the South China Sea to the Gulf of Siam. It contains the Mekong River, the main artery of Southeast Asia. . . . South Vietnam does not exist by itself. Mainland Southeast Asia includes Laos, Cambodia, and the two Vietnams, together comprising former French Indo-China. It also includes Thailand, Burma, and part of Malaysia.

The Southeast Asian peninsula is a richly endowed land area of over 800,000 square miles—roughly the size of the United States east of the Mississippi—and containing almost 100 million people. And immediately beyond to the east are the Philippines, not far to the west is India, to the north is Communist China, and to the south is what the Chinese Communists may consider the greatest prize of all—Indonesia's resources, territory, and the world's fifth largest population, whose strategic location straddles and dominates the gateway to the Indian Ocean. (*New York Times,* March 27, 1964.)

### *"The Greatest Prize"*

"The greatest prize of all," in Communist eyes, says Secretary McNamara, may be Indonesia and its environs. His helicopters, ships, guns, and men are fighting in Vietnam, which does not exist by itself, but is an essential part of a vast forward strategic area which, in the name of freedom and for the profit of Big Business, must be defended against the menace of Communism and kept "free" for the United States merchants, investors, and exploiters.

A Ford Company ex-president and now chief spokesman for the Pentagon has underlined my thesis of Washington's special interests in Asia and rushed to my support with a statement that fully justifies the assumption that Washington considers Far Asia as the next strategic area through which it must advance toward the consummation of its drive for world power.

### *The Going Will Be Tough*

Many obstacles must be surmounted or by-passed before United States control of Asia and the Pacific becomes a reality. The United States economy is overexpanded and debt-ridden; taxes are excessive. The American people dread a general war; they lack respected leadership; they feel no urge to conquer



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or rule the world. At home, American Century advocates face inertia, indifference, fear.

Abroad, active opposition to the American Century idea is growing. First, there is the stubborn refusal of France, Germany, Britain, and Japan to accept an era of American world domination. Support from these nations is a precondition to the success of the American drive to master the Pacific.

Events of the recent past have stirred the former colonial peoples to revolt against foreign control and to struggle for independence and self-determination. Such movements in Asia are well developed and far advanced. At the moment they are led by China, with the active backing of North Korea, North Vietnam, Indonesia, and the support of Japan, Burma, Ceylon.

The Cambodian Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, after a decade of experience with Washington aid renounced and denounced further United States backing on November 12, 1963. Cambodia took this step, the Prince said, first, because of Washington's insistent pressures to force his government to abandon neutralism and line up with the West. A second reason for this step was the disruptive effects of aid on the Cambodian economy. Third, the distribution of dollars had separated the dollar-receiving class from the rest of the Cambodian people. Fourth, the favored dollar recipients were pressured to import luxury items at high prices and to re-sell them at black market prices. Fifth, black-marketing leads to bribery, corruption and the lowering of public morality. ("Why Cambodia Rejected Aid," by Han Suyin, *Eastern Horizon*, February, 1964.)

A further obstacle to the United States program for the "defense" of Asia is the spectacular successes of socialist construction in Europe and Asia and the growing conviction that Asians must avoid new entanglements with their former imperial masters, plan and stabilize their own economies, and get what help they can from like-minded neighbor Asians.

---

The world of the historian, like the world of the scientist, is not a photographic copy of the real world, but rather a working model which enables him more or less effectively to understand it and to master it.

—*E. H. Carr, What Is History?*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# BOOKS

## YESTERDAY'S SUBVERSIVES

BY STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN

Barrows Dunham has written a book* which is, among many other things, a most promising survival kit for the human species. Its contents are infinitely more practical than the sundry survival items revealed in fearful magnification now on the screens of the nation's movie houses in "Dr. Strangelove." This metaphor of a survival kit is employed, not in the least as a term of denigration but in highest praise. In this era of adventuring in South Vietnam, along the Berlin Wall, and in the expulsion of workers from the factories (as the machines of automation are moved in), nothing is more clearly called for than a truly functional survival kit, not of gadgets, but of ideas.

Let not the simplicity of the image deceive you. Professor Dunham is a man of incredible erudition, of almost Olympian awareness of the human record to date, from prehistoric miasma to the nuances of the orthodox mind in Pentagons along the Potomac and the Volga. For all of the myriad delights wedged between its covers (and they are beyond counting, like the stars in the sky), this is a handbook calling for unaccustomed concentration. The habit of capsulating knowledge in a pocket tract or a TV editorial between commercials has almost succeeded in corrupting our powers of prolonged attention.

Most books read better from front to back, but in the case of *Heroes and Heretics* it can be well argued that the Hebrew or Japanese practice of reading from back to front would aid many readers. At least this reviewer proposes that one begin with the Epilogue on page 457 and possibly follow it with chapter 15, the report on our Heroes and Heretics in America. For those who have lately

Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles, Stephen H. Fritchman is himself "in the heretical tradition."

*Barrows Dunham, *Heroes and Heretics,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1964, $6.95.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trembled in their faith that man can find his way out of our present social jungles the *sursum corda* of the six pages 450-456 may well prove to be the most illuminating section of the entire book, assuring him that wisdom is not totally dumb today, nor the will of man to circumvent disaster entirely paralyzed.

All of this is said in preface because too few who run and read today will find the opening chapters on Akhnaton and Socrates as stirring as those in the final sections on Jefferson, Marx, and Debs, not because they lack any of the incandescent wit or the enchanting prose style of the sage of Cynwyd, but because minds nourished on Wheaties and William James have lost the spontaneous power of responding to Egyptian or Greek dialectics.

For thousands of Americans, Dr. Dunham's book will provide their first acquaintance with a writer who is incredibly entertaining, yet also is a teacher who tears away the ambiguities and distortions of philosophy, religion, economics, and politics so that the relevance of these subjects to their own personal lives and futures becomes vividly manifest. Many readers (including those with years of advanced study in our finest universities), will be astonished at what has been kept from them, which they should have found at one place or another during their academic years—a deprivation due more to ignorance than malice on the part of their guides. The malice of the organizational man, sacerdotal or otherwise, however, is never minimized by this wickedly well-informed author, who carries a scalpel as well as a lamp as he takes his friends through the caverns of the past.

For example, it will be news to many readers of *Heroes and Heretics* that the Christian gospels were written to reassure Nero that the authors thereof were really not subversive. To many this book will provide their first acquaintance with the Inquisition presented in terms of politics and depth psychology, rather than ecclesiastical delinquency. Not only does Dr. Dunham present Joan of Arc with exquisite sensitivity; he also presents Jean Brehal, the Grand Inquisitor of France, tardily observing: "To act against conscience is to prepare for hell; there is no need to abdicate, at the demand of a prelate, a well formed conscience founded on a well tested faith." Then Dr. Dunham states, more broadly, one of the great lessons his book reveals: "No man can surrender his power of rational decision without ceasing to be a man. Consequently no leadership may, in law or in morality, require him to do so."

Or, again, he tells us of Benjamin Franklin's contributions to Karl Marx, at the age of fifteen years, of the analysis of exchange value as labor time. Yet again, how many good Christians today know that their arch-advocate, Martin



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Luther, predicted that "one day new lights will rise up, and the Scriptures will be despised and flung away into the corner"? The reader will have his own many surprises, if he recovers his power to enjoy the exhilaration of a really well written book, and if he will leave the entire communications complex of television, radio, and press strictly alone for two entire weeks and stay with *Heroes and Heretics* far into the the night, if such need be the case.

Barrows Dunham defines heresies (p. 5) as "those ideas that disrupt an existing society in such a way as to change, or threaten to change, the distribution of power within it." He then proceeds to report on the men and women who have sought to become scientists (without knowing it), and to accept their world and thus have incurred the implacable hostility of those in the seats of power including the most seditious and corrupt members of the ruling class, the priests. (Corrupt priests are Dr. Dunham's specialty, and he doubtless knows more of their past and present iniquities than any living man.)

The purpose of *Heroes and Heretics* is to present history "as the movement of human multitudes in struggle." It is a book which shows men and women in many lands, under extraordinary as well as ordinary circumstances, employing their reason to resist the implacable demands of the Establishment, be it sacred or secular, in its many claims on their allegiance. He describes with patience and coruscating wit the long controversy between dissenters and administrators, the necessity for institutions, and the infinite peril of them as far as man's felicity is concerned.

The author, as only a great teacher can, brings forth his evidence with unmeasured generosity, then provides the challenge of the precise generalization. Two examples may suffice. In his analysis of the Darwinian revolution, he writes: "The path of ideology, though torn with struggle, has been quite plain. Protestantism affirmed that men can and should make up their own minds. The Enlightement affirmed that, if they did so, they would find the world open to science and responsive to human control. Darwin showed that control over nature could be regarded as the highest form of adaptation. And Marx? Marx showed that man's control over nature needs completion by a similar control over his own society."

His second generalization is in the form of a moral drawn from a survey of modern history: "It is interesting to observe that the whole of modern history (which we may date from Erasmus's youth, as being also the time of Columbus's discoveries), is a record of catastrophic defeat for right-wing politics. The pope lost, the peers lost, the kings lost, the emperors, czars, and kaisers lost, the führers and duces lost,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Asian warlords lost, the imperialists are losing. Almost five hundred years of strife—stubborn, constant, and decisive—proclaim the fact that, short of the maiming or annihilation of our race, the members of it are to be supreme upon the planet, with none to molest them and none to rule."

Dr. Dunham has taken for his canvas the sweep of 3,300 years and presents a few major figures who have challenged the conventional wisdom and stood up to The Organization in a rich infinite variety of ways. He begins with Akhnaton and ends with Eugene Debs. The book is a report on ideas and power drives rather than a series of biographies, though at times the author presents figures with some amplitude to reveal their truly heroic courage, their uncompromising clarity of mind on matters of absolute importance to the human enterprise. It is the hardest of tasks, considering the educational system prevailing in most of our fifty states, to present a political history of philosophy with unquestioned honesty and still keep the reader on board. This, Barrows Dunham manages to do.

He not only presents Jesus, Augustine, Athanasius, Arius, Calvin, Servetus, Luther, Erasmus, Wycliffe, and Cardinal Newman, but also a generous pageant of less familiar persons, some heroic, some ignoble, compromisers or worse: Marc Antonio de Dominis, Peter Waldo, Sir Robert Filmer, Rev. Samuel Parris, and many others.

For many readers the discussion of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and Debs, with their contributions to the rise of modern socialism, will be the most rewarding section of *Heroes and Heretics*. The chapter "Movement, Life and Dialectics" alone would justify the publication of this book in 1964. A whole generation has forgotten its message, if it ever knew it. In an earlier century this book would have been burned by the public hangman for its persuasive or provocative eloquence in the area of creative sedition.

Dr. Dunham presents a survey of the English Chartist movement, including the too little known 1846 speech of George Harney on the character of capitalism, one of the most eloquent passages in all agitational literature in our language. Whether one is a Marxist or not, the summary presentation of "the old thunderer" may well appear to be one of the most important essays in all of Dr. Dunham's writing. Marxism is the heresy of this age in every capitalist country, and this book is published in the strongest capitalist complex in the world. "Marx proposed," says Dr. Dunham, "that economic and political power be taken from those who presently possess it . . . this is the very heart and blood of heresy. It urges the permanent political nullity of capitalism."

The heresies of yesterday, which are described in this book, were of transcendent importance for the protagonists



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves and for future generations who were liberated by their wisdom or were made to despair from their folly and recantations, as the case might be. But Dr. Dunham leaves us in no doubt that our feelings on the socialist heresy are more intense than were those of Arius and Athanasius, Pelagius and Augustine, Abelard and Bernard, Joan of Arc and Cauchon, because our risks are greater. "The present struggle between orthodoxy and heresy, whichever view is held to be the one or the other, may end in the annihilation of mankind." Since March, 1871, in Paris, where the first workers' government in history began, this particular heresy has overshadowed all others. Since that Paris Commune began, the acceleration of change has staggered mankind. A socialist nation is now the second power in the world. Socialism has now passed from theory to fact and men can make comparisons. Dr. Dunham quite simply states one of the most important facts of the present century when he writes: "The day when socialist production begins to exceed capitalist production will see much alteration in men's minds of what is to be believed."

For all of the prevailing bigotry today, and our national impatience with the Bill of Rights and the Constitutional provisions for equality between citizens, Americans still oscillate between demolishing tyranny and demolishing dissent. The author's paean of joy over the American heretical tradition is one of the great passages in the book (p. 425). For all of the almost cosmic candor of his analysis of man against the organization in history, Barrows Dunham is not a despairing man. Although he admits that "victory at the moment is on the side of orthodoxy, and it is complete," it is not his last word. "Orthodoxy has made Americans ignorant of the socialist intent and hostile to it, at the very moment in history when a billion people have entered upon socialist life. It has made a very large population reject certain benefits which that population would, if left to ponder the matter, desire. It has drowned the workers in poppied sleep . . . and all that mighty heart is living still." He then ends his book with an incisive description of the task of all Americans who seek to fulfill the dream of plenitude for the people.

He gives us a rare quotation from Ebenezer Wales of 18th-century Massachusetts Bay Province which begins, "There is a rational pleasure in love and peace" and continues to urge upon all men a listening ear to those with whom they must contend, that they may find correction for their errors or perchance conviction if the case be presented well. America has no more eloquent advocate of love and peace than Barrows Dunham, and few can match him in proposing the avenues which lead to their mutual attainment.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WHERE WE STAND

BY THE EDITORS

During the early years of the 20th century the subject of socialism was widely and eagerly discussed in the United States. Eugene V. Debs, socialist candidate for president, polled close to 1,000,000 votes in 1912—the equivalent of approximately 3,000,000 votes in the 1948 election. The popular interest in socialism was reflected in an enormous sale of socialist literature. *The Appeal to Reason,* a weekly, had a circulation of more than 300,000 for several years; pamphlets by Oscar Ameringer were printed in editions of hundreds of thousands; books by Bellamy, Upton Sinclair, and Jack London ranked with the best-sellers of the day.

This widespread interest in socialism has declined to such an extent that today it would probably not be an exaggeration to say that for the great majority of Americans "socialism" is little more than a dirty word. This is an extraordinary situation because it occurs at the very moment that a large proportion of the rest of the world is moving toward socialism at an unprecedentedly rapid rate. It is a deeply disturbing situation because there are still many Americans who believe with us that, in the long run, socialism will prove to be the only solution to the increasingly serious economic and social problems that face the United States.

It is because we hold firmly to this belief that we are founding MONTHLY REVIEW, an independent magazine devoted to analyzing, from a socialist point of view, the most significant trends in domestic and foreign affairs.

By "socialism" we mean a system of society with two fundamental characteristics: first, public ownership of the decisive sectors of the economy, and second, comprehensive planning of production for the benefit of the producers themselves. The possibility and workability of such a system of society

---

*Reprinted from Vol. I, No. 1 (May, 1949) and the first issue of every subsequent volume.*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are no longer open to doubt. Socialism became a reality with the introduction of the First Five Year Plan in Soviet Russia in 1928; its power to survive was demonstrated by the subsequent economic achievements of the USSR during the '30s, and finally, once and for all, in the war against Nazi Germany. These facts —and they are facts which no amount of wishful thinking can conjure away—give to the USSR a unique importance in the development of socialism and in the history of our time.

We find completely unrealistic the view of those who call themselves socialists, yet imagine that socialism can be built on an international scale by fighting it where it already exists. This is the road to war, not to socialism. On the other hand, we do not accept the view that the USSR is above criticism simply because it is socialist. We believe in, and shall be guided by, the principle that the cause of socialism has everything to gain and nothing to lose from a full and frank discussion of shortcomings, as well as accomplishments, of socialist countries and socialist parties everywhere.

We shall follow the development of socialism all over the world, but we want to emphasize that our major concern is less with socialism abroad than with socialism at home. We are convinced that the sooner the United States is transformed from a capitalist to a socialist society, the better it will be, not only for Americans, but for all mankind.

We believe that there are already many Americans who share this attitude with us and that their number will steadily increase. We ask for their financial support, their assistance in extending our circulation, and their advice as to how MONTHLY REVIEW can best serve the cause of socialism in the United States.

*Clarity about the aims and problems of socialism is of greatest significance in our age of transition. Since, under present circumstances, free and unhindered discussion of these problems has come under a powerful taboo, I consider the founding of this magazine to be an important public service.*

PROFESSOR ALBERT EINSTEIN
in his article "Why Socialism?" in Vol. I, No. 1



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Helen B. Lamb's**

# THE TRAGEDY OF VIETNAM

## Where Do We Go from Here?

in which Dr. Lamb, economist and writer long familiar with the Far East, deals authoritatively with such questions as:
What does "freedom" mean to the Vietnamese?
Who backs the Liberation Front and what is its program?
What sort of war is it—class, civil, international?
Why and by whom was Vietnam divided into North and South?
What is the meaning of "neutralism" for Vietnam?
Imperative reading for MR subscribers. Trenchant, thought-provoking.
Single copy, 10¢; 7 for 50¢; 15 for $1; 50 or more, 40%

**BASIC PAMPHLETS**

DEPARTMENT M, Box 42, Cathedral Station, N. Y. 25

(advertisement)

# HALF PRICE

on

**THREE BOOKS**

by

## SCOTT NEARING

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ECONOMICS FOR THE POWER AGE | list price | $3.00 |
| THE TRAGEDY OF EMPIRE | list price | $2.50 |
| UNITED WORLD | list price | $2.50 |
| | total | $8.00 |

These three clothbound books
sent for $4 postpaid

SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTITUTE Harborside, Maine

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

ologist, will be in the chair; and Harry Magdoff and Paul Sweezy will speak about Paul Baran's life and ideas. In addition, a selection from the tributes which we have received from all over the world will be read.

We also intend to produce a more lasting tribute to Paul Baran's memory in the form of a special issue of *MR* later in the year. Plans are still tentative, but we hope to have contributions from some of the eminent scientists and statesmen around the world who regarded him as one of the great socialist intellectuals of the twentieth century. In addition, we will bring out a volume of his essays and reviews, published and unpublished, for which he had already provided a preliminary table of contents. Finally, *Monopoly Capital,* the book on which he and Paul Sweezy had been working for several years, was substantially completed in first draft at the time of his death. It will be published in due course, by MR Press.

With the irreparable loss of Paul Baran weighing so heavily on our minds and spirits, we find it difficult to talk about "celebrating" the completion of *MR's* first decade and a half. And yet we know that he would have been among the most enthusiastic celebrators if he had lived and would have done all he could to make the long-planned "birthday party" a success. As announced in the April issue, the party will be held at the Park-Sheraton Hotel (7th Avenue at 56th Street) on Wednesday, May 13, at 8:30 P.M. Details will be found in the box on p. 13.

In this issue, as in the first issue of every preceding volume of *MR,* we reprint "Where We Stand" from Volume 1, Number 1. In this statement, we recognized the Soviet Union's "unique importance in the development of socialism and in the history of our time," but added immediately that "we do not accept the view that the USSR is above criticism simply because it is socialist." This was not intended to announce a policy of seeking out and emphasizing negative aspects of Soviet life. That is the business of the reactionaries. But when the CPUSSR or the Soviet government *deliberately* does things that contradict well established principles of decency and socialism, it is necessary to protest in no uncertain terms. Thus we have observed with growing dismay the regular meting out of death sentences in cases of economic crimes. One must say plainly: this is an outrageous, barbaric practice. And when an important official scientific body, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, puts its imprimatur on a book containing pictures of the most vulgar kind of anti-Semitic filth, one can only wonder what is going on in the Soviet Union. That anti-Semitism still exists in the population of the Ukraine is understandable: it takes a long time to change deeply rooted attitudes. But that an official organ of the Soviet government should cater to it is something quite different, and as far as we are concerned absolutely inexcusable. What do our colleagues, the socialist intellectuals of the USSR, have to say about these things? Isn't it high time they began to speak out?

**PAUL A. BARAN MEMORIAL MEETING**
**Sunday, May 24, 3 P.M.**
Heywood Broun Room, Newspaper Guild, 133 W. 44th St.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

# books which you can get ahead of time and save money by ordering now

**WE, THE PEOPLE**

by Leo Huberman

Price on pub date, July 28: ..... $5.00
Prepublication price: ..... 3.00

**MARXISM OF OUR TIME**

by Gilles Martinet

Price on pub date, July 1: ..... $3.25
Prepublication price: ..... 2.00

**THE SOCIALIST REGISTER: 1964**

edited by Ralph Miliband and John Saville

Price on pub date, July 30: ..... $6.00 cloth; $3.45 paper
Prepublication price: ..... 4.00 cloth; 2.50 paper

**PARLIAMENTARY SOCIALISM**

by Ralph Miliband

Price on pub date, Sept. 30: ..... $6.00 cloth; $3.45 paper
Prepublication price: ..... 4.00 cloth; 2.50 paper

**THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL**

by Rosa Luxemburg

Price on pub date, Sept. 30: ..... $7.50 cloth; $3.95 paper
Prepublication price: ..... 5.00 cloth; 2.75 paper

**ORDER NOW AND SAVE**

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York, N. Y. 10014

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED